```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  0101          University of Maryland                              Page  700
Title       COMPOSITION                    Baltimore County                                 AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  SIMS, DIANA                      Spring 2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   19
Questionnaires:  9                Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	3	1	3.33	1583/1670	3.95	4.16	4.31	4.23	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1398/1666	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.30	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1252/1615	4.21	4.31	4.24	4.17	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1257/1566	3.89	4.16	4.07	4.03	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	6	2	3.89	1055/1528	4.41	4.35	4.12	4.00	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1404/1650	4.08	4.06	4.22	4.28	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1216/1667	4.55	4.50	4.67	4.61	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	4	4	0	3.22	1501/1626	4.07	4.14	4.11	4.07	3.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	3	4	0	3.25	1499/1559	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.47	3.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	1453/1560	4.72	4.73	4.72	4.68	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	5	1	1	3.13	1480/1549	4.21	4.33	4.31	4.32	3.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1345/1546	4.13	4.26	4.32	4.32	3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1125/1323	3.60	3.76	4.00	3.91	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1191/1384	4.13	4.28	4.10	3.92	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	915/1378	4.41	4.47	4.29	4.09	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1172/1378	4.58	4.54	4.31	4.08	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	865/ 904	3.73	4.01	4.03	3.94	2.50

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  0201              University of Maryland                           Page  701
Title       COMPOSITION                        Baltimore County                            AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    BLOOM, RYAN I.                      Spring 2008                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    16
Questionnaires:  12                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                         Frequencies          Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  0  4   8  4.67  479/1670  3.95  4.16  4.31  4.23  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  1  11  4.92  155/1666  4.22  4.21  4.27  4.30  4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  11  0  0  1  0   0  3.00 ****/1406  4.49  4.42  4.32  4.31  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   1  0  0  0  2   9  4.82  238/1615  4.21  4.31  4.24  4.17  4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  3  3   6  4.25  643/1566  3.89  4.16  4.07  4.03  4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 4  8  4.67  300/1528  4.41  4.35  4.12  4.00  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  0  1  11  4.92  143/1650  4.08  4.06  4.22  4.28  4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  0  12  5.00    1/1667  4.55  4.50  4.67  4.61  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 1 6  4  4.27  704/1626  4.07  4.14  4.11  4.07  4.27


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  1  0  0  2   9  4.50  896/1559  4.17  4.32  4.46  4.47  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  0  2  10  4.83  777/1560  4.72  4.73  4.72  4.68  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 11  4.92  181/1549  4.21  4.33  4.31  4.32  4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  0  0  2  10  4.83  310/1546  4.13  4.26  4.32  4.32  4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 6 2 0 0 3  1  3.17 1155/1323  3.60  3.76  4.00  3.91  3.17


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 3  8  4.58  384/1384  4.13  4.28  4.10  3.92  4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 5  7  4.58  540/1378  4.41  4.47  4.29  4.09  4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 2 10  4.83  354/1378  4.58  4.54  4.31  4.08  4.83
4. Were special techniques successful                 0   1  0  0  2  6   3  4.09  443/ 904  3.73  4.01  4.03  3.94  4.09

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     7        0.00-0.99    1      A    3       Required for Majors  11    Graduate      0      Major         0
  28-55     1        1.00-1.99    0      B    4
  56-83     0        2.00-2.99    2      C    5       General               0    Under-grad   12      Non-major    12
  84-150    0        3.00-3.49    3      D    0
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00    1      F    0       Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                 2
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  0301           University of Maryland                              Page  702
Title        COMPOSITION                    Baltimore County                                 AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  TERHORST, RAYMO                  Spring 2008                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    22
Questionnaires: 19              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  7  12  4.63   518/1670  3.95  4.16  4.31  4.23  4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  7  12  4.63   452/1666  4.22  4.21  4.27  4.30  4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  11  0  0  0  1   7  4.88   212/1406  4.49  4.42  4.32  4.31  4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  2  4  13  4.58   477/1615  4.21  4.31  4.24  4.17  4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  4  3  11  4.26   632/1566  3.89  4.16  4.07  4.03  4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 3 16  4.84   152/1528  4.41  4.35  4.12  4.00  4.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  1  3  2  13  4.42   690/1650  4.08  4.06  4.22  4.28  4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0 17   1  4.06  1498/1667  4.55  4.50  4.67  4.61  4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 0 0 0 5 11  4.69   263/1626  4.07  4.14  4.11  4.07  4.69


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  0  4  13  4.76   503/1559  4.17  4.32  4.46  4.47  4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  0  2  15  4.88   647/1560  4.72  4.73  4.72  4.68  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  2  4  11  4.53   658/1549  4.21  4.33  4.31  4.32  4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  0  0  1  3  13  4.71   470/1546  4.13  4.26  4.32  4.32  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 3 0 2 2 2  8  4.14   626/1323  3.60  3.76  4.00  3.91  4.14


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 2 3  6  4.36   579/1384  4.13  4.28  4.10  3.92  4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 0 0 1 10  4.91   243/1378  4.41  4.47  4.29  4.09  4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 0 0 1 10 4.91   281/1378  4.58  4.54  4.31  4.08  4.91
4. Were special techniques successful                  9   0  0  0  0  4   6  4.60   202/ 904  3.73  4.01  4.03  3.94  4.60

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                   Type                    Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      5       0.00-0.99    0      A    7      Required for Majors  10    Graduate    0      Major        0
28-55      2       1.00-1.99    0      B    6
56-83      0       2.00-2.99    3      C    0      General               1    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
                                       P    0                                responses to be significant
                                       I    1      Other                 5
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  0401          University of Maryland                       Page  703
Title        COMPOSITION                    Baltimore County                       AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  DUNNIGAN, BRIAN                  Spring 2008                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    18
Questionnaires: 17              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  1  3  3  10  4.29   953/1670  3.95  4.16  4.31  4.23  4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  5  11  4.59   516/1666  4.22  4.21  4.27  4.30  4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  11  0  0  0  0   6  5.00     1/1406  4.49  4.42  4.32  4.31  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  7   9  4.47   592/1615  4.21  4.31  4.24  4.17  4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  1  3  12  4.69   280/1566  3.89  4.16  4.07  4.03  4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 6 11  4.65   315/1528  4.41  4.35  4.12  4.00  4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   1  0  0  2  6   8  4.38   757/1650  4.08  4.06  4.22  4.28  4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  2 13   2  4.00  1524/1667  4.55  4.50  4.67  4.61  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 1 5 10  4.56   355/1626  4.07  4.14  4.11  4.07  4.56


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  2  2  12  4.63   739/1559  4.17  4.32  4.46  4.47  4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  0  16  5.00     1/1560  4.72  4.73  4.72  4.68  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  1  2  13  4.75   366/1549  4.21  4.33  4.31  4.32  4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  0  2  14  4.88   265/1546  4.13  4.26  4.32  4.32  4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 11 0 2 0 1  2  3.60   990/1323  3.60  3.76  4.00  3.91  3.60


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 2  8  4.80   221/1384  4.13  4.28  4.10  3.92  4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 1 0  9  4.80   348/1378  4.41  4.47  4.29  4.09  4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 1 0 0 0  9  4.60   590/1378  4.58  4.54  4.31  4.08  4.60
4. Were special techniques successful                  8   1  0  0  4  2   2  3.75   629/ 904  3.73  4.01  4.03  3.94  3.75


                              Frequency Distribution
```

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      7      0.00-0.99   1       A    6       Required for Majors  13     Graduate     0      Major        0
28-55      1      1.00-1.99   0       B    7
56-83      1      2.00-2.99   2       C    2       General               0     Under-grad  17      Non-major   17
84-150     0      3.00-3.49   4       D    0
Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   4       F    1       Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                      I    0       Other                 4
                                      ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  0701           University of Maryland                          Page  704
Title      COMPOSITION                       Baltimore County                          AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   BROFMAN, MARGAR                  Spring 2008                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   18
Questionnaires: 13                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                 Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                  NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   1   3   1   5   3  3.46 1548/1670  3.95  4.16  4.31  4.23  3.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   1   2   2   8  4.31  908/1666  4.22  4.21  4.27  4.30  4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   4   1   0   3   3   2  3.56 1262/1406  4.49  4.42  4.32  4.31  3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0   0   5   3   5  4.00 1083/1615  4.21  4.31  4.24  4.17  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1   1   2   2   5   2  3.42 1341/1566  3.89  4.16  4.07  4.03  3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0   0   0   1   5   7  4.46  476/1528  4.41  4.35  4.12  4.00  4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   1   4   2   6  4.00 1135/1650  4.08  4.06  4.22  4.28  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0   0   0   1  11  4.92  607/1667  4.55  4.50  4.67  4.61  4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0   0   0   3   5   2  3.90 1124/1626  4.07  4.14  4.11  4.07  3.90


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0   1   1   2   2   5  3.82 1391/1559  4.17  4.32  4.46  4.47  3.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0   0   0   0   2   9  4.82  829/1560  4.72  4.73  4.72  4.68  4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0   0   1   4   1   5  3.91 1237/1549  4.21  4.33  4.31  4.32  3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0   1   2   1   2   5  3.73 1305/1546  4.13  4.26  4.32  4.32  3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  9   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/1323  3.60  3.76  4.00  3.91  ****


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5   0   3   0   0   2   3  3.25 1200/1384  4.13  4.28  4.10  3.92  3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5   0   0   0   1   3   4  4.38  751/1378  4.41  4.47  4.29  4.09  4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0   0   0   1   1   6  4.63  570/1378  4.58  4.54  4.31  4.08  4.63
4. Were special techniques successful                   5   3   0   1   1   2   1  3.60  698/ 904  3.73  4.01  4.03  3.94  3.60


                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  12   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 232  ****  ****  4.19  4.25  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 239  ****  ****  4.21  4.35  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 12 0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 230  ****  ****  4.44  4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           12   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 231  ****  ****  4.31  4.45  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 218  ****  ****  4.18  4.47  ****


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  87  ****  4.83  4.65  4.67  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 12 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  4.38  4.64  4.72  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 12  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  75  ****  4.50  4.57  4.46  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    12   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  4.00  4.45  4.59  ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 12   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50  3.91  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 12   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.19  4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       12   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.62  4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   12   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.27  4.42  ****


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 12  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64  4.59  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    12   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67  4.83  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      12   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54  4.46  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       12   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84  4.75  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     12   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/   6  ****  ****  4.92  4.83  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  0901              University of Maryland                          Page  705
Title          COMPOSITION                    Baltimore County                            AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    MCGURRIN JR, AN                   Spring 2008                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    24
Questionnaires: 10                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  2  1  1  3  3  3.40 1566/1670  3.95  4.16  4.31  4.23  3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  1  2  2  4  3.70 1435/1666  4.22  4.21  4.27  4.30  3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   4  1  0  1  1  3  3.83 1169/1406  4.49  4.42  4.32  4.31  3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   3  1  0  1  3  2  3.71 1349/1615  4.21  4.31  4.24  4.17  3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  2  1  2  4  3.60 1230/1566  3.89  4.16  4.07  4.03  3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0  1  2  3  3  3.89 1055/1528  4.41  4.35  4.12  4.00  3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   3  0  0  3  2  2  3.86 1304/1650  4.08  4.06  4.22  4.28  3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  1  4  3  0  2  2.80 1665/1667  4.55  4.50  4.67  4.61  2.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  1  1  1  4  0  3.14 1521/1626  4.07  4.14  4.11  4.07  3.14


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  2  0  3  3  2  3.30 1492/1559  4.17  4.32  4.46  4.47  3.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  1  0  1  2  6  4.20 1427/1560  4.72  4.73  4.72  4.68  4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  2  0  4  3  1  3.10 1483/1549  4.21  4.33  4.31  4.32  3.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   1  2  1  3  2  1  2.89 1498/1546  4.13  4.26  4.32  4.32  2.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5  1  0  1  2  0  3.00 1179/1323  3.60  3.76  4.00  3.91  3.00


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  0  0  3  1  1  3.60 1057/1384  4.13  4.28  4.10  3.92  3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  1  1  2  0  1  2.80 1334/1378  4.41  4.47  4.29  4.09  2.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0  0  0  2  1  2  4.00  977/1378  4.58  4.54  4.31  4.08  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   2  0  1  1  0  1  3.33  779/ 904  3.73  4.01  4.03  3.94  3.33

                                  Frequency Distribution

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

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 16   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                             Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  2  1  4  6  3  3.44 1557/1670  3.95  4.16  4.31  4.23  3.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  3  4  7  2  0  2.50 1645/1666  4.22  4.21  4.27  4.30  2.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  14  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/1406  4.49  4.42  4.32  4.31  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  2  3  4  7  0  3.00 1565/1615  4.21  4.31  4.24  4.17  3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2  1  4  5  2  2  3.00 1478/1566  3.89  4.16  4.07  4.03  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 1 2 4 7  3.81 1113/1528  4.41  4.35  4.12  4.00  3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  8  3  3  2  0  1.94 1639/1650  4.08  4.06  4.22  4.28  1.94
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  1 15  4.94  472/1667  4.55  4.50  4.67  4.61  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 1 2 7 5 1  3.19 1513/1626  4.07  4.14  4.11  4.07  3.19


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  4  4  6  1  1  2.44 1544/1559  4.17  4.32  4.46  4.47  2.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  1  0  1 14  4.75  948/1560  4.72  4.73  4.72  4.68  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  3  7  5  0  3.13 1478/1549  4.21  4.33  4.31  4.32  3.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  3  3  4  4  2  2.94 1489/1546  4.13  4.26  4.32  4.32  2.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 7 1 1 3 4 0  3.11 1170/1323  3.60  3.76  4.00  3.91  3.11


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 1 1 1 2 5  3.90  932/1384  4.13  4.28  4.10  3.92  3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 1 2 1 6  4.20  894/1378  4.41  4.47  4.29  4.09  4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 1 0 2 2 5  4.00  977/1378  4.58  4.54  4.31  4.08  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 6   1  1  0  1  5  2  3.78  619/ 904  3.73  4.01  4.03  3.94  3.78
```

                                        Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades           Reasons                Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      6      0.00-0.99    1        A    2       Required for Majors  10     Graduate     0       Major        0
28-55      4      1.00-1.99    0        B   11
56-83      0      2.00-2.99    2        C    3       General               0     Under-grad  16       Non-major   16
84-150     0      3.00-3.49    3        D    0
Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    1        F    0       Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                 5
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  1201                 University of Maryland                           Page 707
Title        COMPOSITION                          Baltimore County                             AUG 6, 2008
Instructor:  PUTZEL, DIANE M                        Spring 2008                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     15
Questionnaires: 14                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions               NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean      Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   1   1   7   5  4.14 1116/1670  3.95  4.16  4.31  4.23  4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   1   8   4  4.07 1154/1666  4.22  4.21  4.27  4.30  4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   9   0   0   0   1   4  4.80  261/1406  4.49  4.42  4.32  4.31  4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   3   5   6  4.21  922/1615  4.21  4.31  4.24  4.17  4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   1   2   3   8  4.29  610/1566  3.89  4.16  4.07  4.03  4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0   0   1   3   9  4.62  338/1528  4.41  4.35  4.12  4.00  4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   4   4   6  4.14 1032/1650  4.08  4.06  4.22  4.28  4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0  14  5.00    1/1667  4.55  4.50  4.67  4.61  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  1   0   1   4   5  4.09  905/1626  4.07  4.14  4.11  4.07  4.09


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   1   5   8  4.50  896/1559  4.17  4.32  4.46  4.47  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   4  10  4.71 1023/1560  4.72  4.73  4.72  4.68  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   0   0   7   6  4.46  736/1549  4.21  4.33  4.31  4.32  4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   2   3   9  4.50  715/1546  4.13  4.26  4.32  4.32  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1  0   0   2   3   8  4.46  364/1323  3.60  3.76  4.00  3.91  4.46


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0   0   0   0   4   8  4.67  324/1384  4.13  4.28  4.10  3.92  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0   0   0   0   4   8  4.67  481/1378  4.41  4.47  4.29  4.09  4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0   0   0   3   9  4.75  439/1378  4.58  4.54  4.31  4.08  4.75
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   0   1   0   2   3   6  4.08  445/ 904  3.73  4.01  4.03  3.94  4.08

                                        Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  1401              University of Maryland                          Page  708
Title       COMPOSITION                        Baltimore County                          AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  SNEERINGER, HOL                      Spring 2008                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires:  12                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  1  0  1  2  8  4.33   902/1670  3.95  4.16  4.31  4.23  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  6  6  4.50   622/1666  4.22  4.21  4.27  4.30  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   7  0  0  0  1  3  4.75   318/1406  4.49  4.42  4.32  4.31  4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   1  0  0  2  3  5  4.30   813/1615  4.21  4.31  4.24  4.17  4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  1  2  8  4.64   317/1566  3.89  4.16  4.07  4.03  4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  0  1  2  8  4.64   323/1528  4.41  4.35  4.12  4.00  4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  1  0  1  3  7  4.25   903/1650  4.08  4.06  4.22  4.28  4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00     1/1667  4.55  4.50  4.67  4.61  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  0  4  6  4.60   324/1626  4.07  4.14  4.11  4.07  4.60


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  0  3  8  4.73   572/1559  4.17  4.32  4.46  4.47  4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  1  0 10  4.82   829/1560  4.72  4.73  4.72  4.68  4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  1  3  7  4.55   634/1549  4.21  4.33  4.31  4.32  4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  0  1  3  7  4.55   667/1546  4.13  4.26  4.32  4.32  4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  7  1  0  0  2  0  3.00  1179/1323  3.60  3.76  4.00  3.91  3.00


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5   0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71   285/1384  4.13  4.28  4.10  3.92  4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5   0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71   441/1378  4.41  4.47  4.29  4.09  4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00     1/1378  4.58  4.54  4.31  4.08  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   6   1  0  0  1  3  1  4.00   461/ 904  3.73  4.01  4.03  3.94  4.00

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned           Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      4       0.00-0.99     0        A    4         Required for Majors   5      Graduate     0       Major        2
  28-55      0       1.00-1.99     0        B    4                                     Under-grad   12      Non-major   10
  56-83      0       2.00-2.99     1        C    1         General               1      Under-grad   12      Non-major   10
  84-150     1       3.00-3.49     0        D    0
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00     3        F    0         Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                       responses to be significant
                                           I    0         Other                 3
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  1501              University of Maryland                          Page  709
Title         COMPOSITION                     Baltimore County                             AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   WALTERS, APRIL                     Spring 2008                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   22
Questionnaires: 14                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions             NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  1  1  2  3  7  4.00 1216/1670  3.95  4.16  4.31  4.23  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  2  7  5  4.21 1015/1666  4.22  4.21  4.27  4.30  4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  9  0  0  1  3  1  4.00 1057/1406  4.49  4.42  4.32  4.31  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  1  0  0  1  6  6  4.38  712/1615  4.21  4.31  4.24  4.17  4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  2  2  0  3  2  4  3.55 1263/1566  3.89  4.16  4.07  4.03  3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  4  9  4.57  368/1528  4.41  4.35  4.12  4.00  4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  1  0  0  4  1  8  4.31  844/1650  4.08  4.06  4.22  4.28  4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  1  0  0  0  5  8  4.62 1072/1667  4.55  4.50  4.67  4.61  4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0  0  0  3  6  3  4.00  953/1626  4.07  4.14  4.11  4.07  4.00


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  1  5  7  4.46  946/1559  4.17  4.32  4.46  4.47  4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  3 10  4.77  929/1560  4.72  4.73  4.72  4.68  4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  1  6  6  4.38  840/1549  4.21  4.33  4.31  4.32  4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  1  0  4  1  7  4.00 1139/1546  4.13  4.26  4.32  4.32  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  0  1  0  4  4  4  3.77  912/1323  3.60  3.76  4.00  3.91  3.77


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10  0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  670/1384  4.13  4.28  4.10  3.92  4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10  0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  860/1378  4.41  4.47  4.29  4.09  4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  439/1378  4.58  4.54  4.31  4.08  4.75
4. Were special techniques successful                  11  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/ 904  3.73  4.01  4.03  3.94  ****

                                 Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  1601              University of Maryland                              Page  710
Title         COMPOSITION                     Baltimore County                                 AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   PUTZEL, DIANE M                    Spring 2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    21
Questionnaires: 15                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  2  4   9  4.47  722/1670  3.95  4.16  4.31  4.23  4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  4  10  4.60  490/1666  4.22  4.21  4.27  4.30  4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  11  0  0  0  1   3  4.75  318/1406  4.49  4.42  4.32  4.31  4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  4  11  4.73  308/1615  4.21  4.31  4.24  4.17  4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  2  5   8  4.40  491/1566  3.89  4.16  4.07  4.03  4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  2  3  10  4.53  398/1528  4.41  4.35  4.12  4.00  4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  2  3  10  4.53  527/1650  4.08  4.06  4.22  4.28  4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  1  14  4.93  472/1667  4.55  4.50  4.67  4.61  4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  0  0  0  6   8  4.57  347/1626  4.07  4.14  4.11  4.07  4.57


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  1  3  11  4.67  673/1559  4.17  4.32  4.46  4.47  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  1  1  13  4.80  855/1560  4.72  4.73  4.72  4.68  4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  1  2  12  4.73  395/1549  4.21  4.33  4.31  4.32  4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  0  3  12  4.80  345/1546  4.13  4.26  4.32  4.32  4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  1  0  0  5   9  4.40  423/1323  3.60  3.76  4.00  3.91  4.40


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0  0  0  1  1  11  4.77  249/1384  4.13  4.28  4.10  3.92  4.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0  0  0  3  1   9  4.46  649/1378  4.41  4.47  4.29  4.09  4.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  0  1  12  4.92  225/1378  4.58  4.54  4.31  4.08  4.92
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   3  0  0  1  4   5  4.40  289/ 904  3.73  4.01  4.03  3.94  4.40

                                       Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  1701                 University of Maryland                        Page  711
Title        COMPOSITION                         Baltimore County                          AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   WALTERS, APRIL                       Spring 2008                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    21
Questionnaires: 12                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                               Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   2   2   6   2  3.67 1486/1670  3.95 4.16  4.31 4.23  3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   1   6   4  4.08 1148/1666  4.22 4.21  4.27 4.30  4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   9   0   0   0   2   1  4.33  799/1406  4.49 4.42  4.32 4.31  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0   0   0   2   3   6  4.36  737/1615  4.21 4.31  4.24 4.17  4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   1   2   2   7   0  3.25 1406/1566  3.89 4.16  4.07 4.03  3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   0   1   5   6  4.42  546/1528  4.41 4.35  4.12 4.00  4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   2   4   6  4.33  806/1650  4.08 4.06  4.22 4.28  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   9   3  4.25 1368/1667  4.55 4.50  4.67 4.61  4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1  0   0   1   7   1  4.00  953/1626  4.07 4.14  4.11 4.07  4.00


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   1   1   6   3  4.00 1280/1559  4.17 4.32  4.46 4.47  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   0   1  10  4.91  596/1560  4.72 4.73  4.72 4.68  4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   0   2   5   4  4.18 1036/1549  4.21 4.33  4.31 4.32  4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0   0   3   5   3  4.00 1139/1546  4.13 4.26  4.32 4.32  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 1  1   0   3   5   0  3.33 1099/1323  3.60 3.76  4.00 3.91  3.33


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0   1   0   2   4   0  3.29 1191/1384  4.13 4.28  4.10 3.92  3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0   0   0   2   2   3  4.14  915/1378  4.41 4.47  4.29 4.09  4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0  0   0   1   4   2  4.14  926/1378  4.58 4.54  4.31 4.08  4.14
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   2   0   2   0   3   0  3.20  802/ 904  3.73 4.01  4.03 3.94  3.20


                Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 239  **** ****  4.21 4.35  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 11 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 230  **** ****  4.44 4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           11   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 231  **** ****  4.31 4.45  ****


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 11 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  87  **** 4.83  4.65 4.67  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 11 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  79  **** 4.38  4.64 4.72  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 11 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  75  **** 4.50  4.57 4.46  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    11   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  79  **** 4.00  4.45 4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                11   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  80  **** 4.33  3.97 3.99  ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 11  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  41  **** ****  4.50 3.91  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 11  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  38  **** ****  4.19 4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       11   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  38  **** ****  4.62 4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   11   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  39  **** ****  4.27 4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 11  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  31  **** ****  4.47 4.28  ****


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 11 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  28  **** ****  4.64 4.59  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    11   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  16  **** ****  4.67 4.83  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      11   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  27  **** ****  4.54 4.46  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       11   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  10  **** ****  4.84 4.75  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     11   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/   6  **** ****  4.92 4.83  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  1901              University of Maryland                              Page  712
Title       COMPOSITION                        Baltimore County                              AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   MACEK, PHILIP                       Spring 2008                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    21
Questionnaires:  11                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  2  3  2  3  1  2.82 1639/1670  3.95  4.16  4.31  4.23  2.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  3  3  5  4.18 1048/1666  4.22  4.21  4.27  4.30  4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   5  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  423/1406  4.49  4.42  4.32  4.31  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  4  4  3  3.91 1234/1615  4.21  4.31  4.24  4.17  3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   0  0  2  6  1  0  2.89 1515/1566  3.89  4.16  4.07  4.03  2.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0  0  0  3  3  3  4.00  899/1528  4.41  4.35  4.12  4.00  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0  0  0  4  2  3  3.89 1288/1650  4.08  4.06  4.22  4.28  3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1667  4.55  4.50  4.67  4.61  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  2  7  1  3.90 1124/1626  4.07  4.14  4.11  4.07  3.90


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         4   0  0  0  1  2  4  4.43  996/1559  4.17  4.32  4.46  4.47  4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    4   0  0  0  1  1  5  4.57 1188/1560  4.72  4.73  4.72  4.68  4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4   0  0  0  1  2  4  4.43  789/1549  4.21  4.33  4.31  4.32  4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      4   0  1  1  1  2  2  3.43 1404/1546  4.13  4.26  4.32  4.32  3.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  6  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/1323  3.60  3.76  4.00  3.91  ****


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5   0  0  1  2  1  2  3.67 1033/1384  4.13  4.28  4.10  3.92  3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  316/1378  4.41  4.47  4.29  4.09  4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1378  4.58  4.54  4.31  4.08  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   5   3  0  2  0  1  0  2.67  860/ 904  3.73  4.01  4.03  3.94  2.67
```

```
                                       Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  2001              University of Maryland                                    Page  713
Title        COMPOSITION                       Baltimore County                                    AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  WILKINSON, RACH                     Spring 2008                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     25
Questionnaires: 17                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
          General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  1  4  12  4.65   505/1670  3.95  4.16  4.31  4.23  4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  0  17  5.00     1/1666  4.22  4.21  4.27  4.30  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   9  0  0  0  1   7  4.88   212/1406  4.49  4.42  4.32  4.31  4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2  0  0  1  4  10  4.60   446/1615  4.21  4.31  4.24  4.17  4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  1  2  13  4.75   226/1566  3.89  4.16  4.07  4.03  4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  0  1  2  13  4.75   221/1528  4.41  4.35  4.12  4.00  4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  0  3  2  11  4.50   570/1650  4.08  4.06  4.22  4.28  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  5  11  4.69  1002/1667  4.55  4.50  4.67  4.61  4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  0  0  2  12  4.86   141/1626  4.07  4.14  4.11  4.07  4.86


          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  0  0  0  2  13  4.87   339/1559  4.17  4.32  4.46  4.47  4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  0  0  0  1  14  4.93   417/1560  4.72  4.73  4.72  4.68  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  0  1  1  13  4.80   294/1549  4.21  4.33  4.31  4.32  4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  0  0  0  0  15  5.00     1/1546  4.13  4.26  4.32  4.32  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  2  1  0  3  3   6  4.00   692/1323  3.60  3.76  4.00  3.91  4.00


          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0  0  0  2  1  10  4.62   364/1384  4.13  4.28  4.10  3.92  4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0  0  0  0  2  11  4.85   306/1378  4.41  4.47  4.29  4.09  4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0  0  0  0  0  13  5.00     1/1378  4.58  4.54  4.31  4.08  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   4   2  0  0  1  3   7  4.55   226/ 904  3.73  4.01  4.03  3.94  4.55


          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  16   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/ 232  ****  ****  4.19  4.25  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 0 0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/ 239  ****  ****  4.21  4.35  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/ 230  ****  ****  4.44  4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           16   0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/ 231  ****  ****  4.31  4.45  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/ 218  ****  ****  4.18  4.47  ****


          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  87  ****  4.83  4.65  4.67  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 0  1  0   0  3.00  ****/  79  ****  4.38  4.64  4.72  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  75  ****  4.50  4.57  4.46  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    16   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  79  ****  4.00  4.45  4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                16   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  80  ****  4.33  3.97  3.99  ****


          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50  3.91  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  38  ****  ****  4.19  4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       16   0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  38  ****  ****  4.62  4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   16   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  39  ****  ****  4.27  4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  31  ****  ****  4.47  4.28  ****


          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64  4.59  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    16   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67  4.83  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      16   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54  4.46  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       16   0  0  0  1  0   0  3.00  ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84  4.75  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     16   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/   6  ****  ****  4.92  4.83  ****
```

                                        Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0101                    University of Maryland                           Page  714
Title         COMPOSITION                           Baltimore County                             AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   DUNNIGAN, BRIAN                          Spring 2008                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires: 15                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank  Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  1  3 11  4.67  479/1670  4.24 4.16  4.31 4.23  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  4 10  4.60  490/1666  4.40 4.21  4.27 4.30  4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   7  0  0  1  0  7  4.75  318/1406  4.41 4.42  4.32 4.31  4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   2  0  0  0  5  8  4.62  434/1615  4.44 4.31  4.24 4.17  4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  4 11  4.73  242/1566  4.11 4.16  4.07 4.03  4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 3 12 4.80  173/1528  4.53 4.35  4.12 4.00  4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  0  6  9  4.60  429/1650  4.24 4.06  4.22 4.28  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0 12  3  4.20 1409/1667  4.36 4.50  4.67 4.61  4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 2 1 11 4.64 293/1626  4.42 4.14  4.11 4.07  4.64


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  0  0  3 11  4.79  469/1559  4.49 4.32  4.46 4.47  4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  0  0  1 13  4.93  477/1560  4.83 4.73  4.72 4.68  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  1  4  8  4.54  646/1549  4.59 4.33  4.31 4.32  4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2   0  0  0  0  5  8  4.62  582/1546  4.48 4.26  4.32 4.32  4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 5 1 0 1 0  5  4.14  626/1323  4.03 3.76  4.00 3.91  4.14


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 1 1 7  4.67  324/1384  4.33 4.28  4.10 3.92  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 0 1 2 6  4.56  564/1378  4.54 4.47  4.29 4.09  4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 1 0 8 4.78 417/1378  4.52 4.54  4.31 4.08  4.78
4. Were special techniques successful                 6   1  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  146/ 904  4.17 4.01  4.03 3.94  4.75


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 14  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 232  **** ****  4.19 4.25  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 239  **** ****  4.21 4.35  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 14 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 230  **** ****  4.44 4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          14  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 231  **** ****  4.31 4.45  ****

                              Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0201                University of Maryland                                    Page  715
Title          COMPOSITION                      Baltimore County                                       AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    BROFMAN, MARGAR (Instr. A)        Spring 2008                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    22
Questionnaires: 15                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                    NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   6   3   6  4.00 1216/1670  4.24  4.16  4.31  4.23  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   4   5   6  4.13 1103/1666  4.40  4.21  4.27  4.30  4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   2   1   2   3   7  3.80 1186/1406  4.41  4.42  4.32  4.31  3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   4   3   8  4.27  861/1615  4.44  4.31  4.24  4.17  4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1   1   1   4   4   4  3.64 1210/1566  4.11  4.16  4.07  4.03  3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   0   2   6   7  4.33  631/1528  4.53  4.35  4.12  4.00  4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   1   0   3   6   5  3.93 1235/1650  4.24  4.06  4.22  4.28  3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   1   1  13  4.80  861/1667  4.36  4.50  4.67  4.61  4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1  0   0   3   3   5  4.18  808/1626  4.42  4.14  4.11  4.07  4.18


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   1   0   2   5   7  4.13 1237/1559  4.49  4.32  4.46  4.47  4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   4  11  4.73  985/1560  4.83  4.73  4.72  4.68  4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   1   0   2   6   6  4.07 1120/1549  4.59  4.33  4.31  4.32  4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   1   0   3   4   6  4.00 1139/1546  4.48  4.26  4.32  4.32  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 6  2   1   1   3   1  3.00 1179/1323  4.03  3.76  4.00  3.91  3.00


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0  0   0   2   4   4  4.20  712/1384  4.33  4.28  4.10  3.92  4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0  0   0   2   1   7  4.50  603/1378  4.54  4.47  4.29  4.09  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 1  0   2   1   6  4.10  948/1378  4.52  4.54  4.31  4.08  4.10
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   5   0   0   3   0   2  3.80  605/ 904  4.17  4.01  4.03  3.94  3.80
```

                          Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades            Reasons                  Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      6       0.00-0.99    0          A    4       Required for Majors  11     Graduate      0      Major         0
28-55      1       1.00-1.99    0          B   10
56-83      0       2.00-2.99    2          C    0       General               0     Under-grad   15      Non-major    15
84-150     0       3.00-3.49    0          D    0
Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    2          F    0       Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                           I    0       Other                 3
                                           ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0201            University of Maryland                              Page  716
Title        COMPOSITION                     Baltimore County                               AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  BROFMAN, MARGAR (Instr. B)      Spring 2008                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     22
Questionnaires:  15                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  6  3  6  4.00 1216/1670  4.24 4.16  4.31 4.23  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  4  5  6  4.13 1103/1666  4.40 4.21  4.27 4.30  4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  2  1  2  3  7  3.80 1186/1406  4.41 4.42  4.32 4.31  3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  4  3  8  4.27  861/1615  4.44 4.31  4.24 4.17  4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1  1  1  4  4  4  3.64 1210/1566  4.11 4.16  4.07 4.03  3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  2  6  7  4.33  631/1528  4.53 4.35  4.12 4.00  4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  0  3  6  5  3.93 1235/1650  4.24 4.06  4.22 4.28  3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  1  1 13  4.80  861/1667  4.36 4.50  4.67 4.61  4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 13 0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/1626  4.42 4.14  4.11 4.07  4.18


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        11  0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25 1157/1559  4.49 4.32  4.46 4.47  4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   12  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/1560  4.83 4.73  4.72 4.68  4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 12  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/1549  4.59 4.33  4.31 4.32  4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     12  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/1546  4.48 4.26  4.32 4.32  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 12 2  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/1323  4.03 3.76  4.00 3.91  3.00


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  5  0  0  0  2  4  4  4.20  712/1384  4.33 4.28  4.10 3.92  4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  5  0  0  0  2  1  7  4.50  603/1378  4.54 4.47  4.29 4.09  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0  1  0  2  1  6  4.10  948/1378  4.52 4.54  4.31 4.08  4.10
4. Were special techniques successful                    5  5  0  0  3  0  2  3.80  605/ 904  4.17 4.01  4.03 3.94  3.80

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades            Reasons                    Type                      Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     6       0.00-0.99    0        A   4        Required for Majors  11      Graduate     0        Major        0
  28-55     1       1.00-1.99    0        B  10
  56-83     0       2.00-2.99    2        C   0        General               0      Under-grad  15        Non-major   15
  84-150    0       3.00-3.49    0        D   0
  Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    2        F   0        Electives             1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P   0                                    responses to be significant
                                          I   0        Other                 3
                                          ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0301                University of Maryland                            Page  717
Title        COMPOSITION                         Baltimore County                          AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  BLOOM, RYAN I.                        Spring 2008                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    19
Questionnaires: 17                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
         Questions                       NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
         General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  2  2  9  4  3.88 1358/1670  4.24  4.16  4.31 4.23  3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  3  8  6  4.18 1059/1666  4.40  4.21  4.27 4.30  4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  12  0  0  1  2  2  4.20  924/1406  4.41  4.42  4.32 4.31  4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  4  7  5  3.94 1173/1615  4.44  4.31  4.24 4.17  3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0  1  2  5  5  4  3.53 1274/1566  4.11  4.16  4.07 4.03  3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 11 4  4.12  832/1528  4.53  4.35  4.12 4.00  4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  2  1  8  6  4.06 1107/1650  4.24  4.06  4.22 4.28  4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  8  9  4.53 1142/1667  4.36  4.50  4.67 4.61  4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 2 1 9 3  3.87 1162/1626  4.42  4.14  4.11 4.07  3.87


         Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  0 10  7  4.41 1009/1559  4.49  4.32  4.46 4.47  4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  0  1 16  4.94  358/1560  4.83  4.73  4.72 4.68  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0  3  6  8  4.29  944/1549  4.59  4.33  4.31 4.32  4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  0  1  8  8  4.41  835/1546  4.48  4.26  4.32 4.32  4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 7 1 1 6 1 1  3.00 1179/1323  4.03  3.76  4.00 3.91  3.00


         Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 4 5 6  4.00  820/1384  4.33  4.28  4.10 3.92  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 2 4 10  4.50  603/1378  4.54  4.47  4.29 4.09  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 1 3 12  4.69  511/1378  4.52  4.54  4.31 4.08  4.69
4. Were special techniques successful                 1   0  0  1  2 10  3  3.94  537/ 904  4.17  4.01  4.03 3.94  3.94


         Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 16  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 232  ****  ****  4.19 4.25  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/ 239  ****  ****  4.21 4.35  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/ 230  ****  ****  4.44 4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          16  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 231  ****  ****  4.31 4.45  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 218  ****  ****  4.18 4.47  ****


         Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/  87  ****  4.83  4.65 4.67  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/  79  ****  4.38  4.64 4.72  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  75  ****  4.50  4.57 4.46  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   16  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  79  ****  4.00  4.45 4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               16  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  4.33  3.97 3.99  ****


         Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50 3.91  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.19 4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      16  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.62 4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  16  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.27 4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16 0 1 0 0 0 0  1.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.47 4.28  ****


         Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64 4.59  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   16  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67 4.83  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     16  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54 4.46  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      16  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84 4.75  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    16  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/   6  ****  ****  4.92 4.83  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0401           University of Maryland                           Page  718
Title       COMPOSITION                      Baltimore County                           AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  FINDLAY, JOANNA (Instr. A)        Spring 2008                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   21
Questionnaires: 16              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                           Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  1  0  7  7  4.13 1139/1670  4.24  4.16  4.31  4.23  4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  1  6  8  4.31  895/1666  4.40  4.21  4.27  4.30  4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   7  0  0  2  2  5  4.33  799/1406  4.41  4.42  4.32  4.31  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   3  1  0  1  4  7  4.23  898/1615  4.44  4.31  4.24  4.17  4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  1  0  2  4  9  4.25  643/1566  4.11  4.16  4.07  4.03  4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  0  1  5  9  4.53  398/1528  4.53  4.35  4.12  4.00  4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   1  1  0  5  7  2  3.60 1430/1650  4.24  4.06  4.22  4.28  3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  1  2 12  1  3.81 1623/1667  4.36  4.50  4.67  4.61  3.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1  0  0  0  2 12  4.86  141/1626  4.42  4.14  4.11  4.07  4.85


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  1  5 10  4.56  821/1559  4.49  4.32  4.46  4.47  4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  2 14  4.88  673/1560  4.83  4.73  4.72  4.68  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  1  4 11  4.63  537/1549  4.59  4.33  4.31  4.32  4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  1  0  1  5  9  4.31  939/1546  4.48  4.26  4.32  4.32  4.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3  0  1  1  4  7  4.31  507/1323  4.03  3.76  4.00  3.91  4.40


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  1  0  5  7  4.38  560/1384  4.33  4.28  4.10  3.92  4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  1  0  2 10  4.62  517/1378  4.54  4.47  4.29  4.09  4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  0  0  0  1 12  4.92  225/1378  4.52  4.54  4.31  4.08  4.92
4. Were special techniques successful                   3  2  0  0  3  4  4  4.09  443/ 904  4.17  4.01  4.03  3.94  4.09

                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                 Type                   Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27    10      0.00-0.99    0      A  12        Required for Majors  11     Graduate     0      Major         0
28-55     1      1.00-1.99    0      B   2
56-83     1      2.00-2.99    5      C   0        General              0      Under-grad  16      Non-major    16
84-150    0      3.00-3.49    2      D   0
Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    3      F   0        Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                     P   0                                    responses to be significant
                                     I   0        Other                4
                                     ?   0
```

```
                                                     Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                    NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean   Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   1   1   0   7   7  4.13 1139/1670  4.24 4.16  4.31 4.23  4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   1   6   8  4.31  895/1666  4.40 4.21  4.27 4.30  4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   7   0   0   2   2   5  4.33  799/1406  4.41 4.42  4.32 4.31  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   3   1   0   1   4   7  4.23  898/1615  4.44 4.31  4.24 4.17  4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   1   0   2   4   9  4.25  643/1566  4.11 4.16  4.07 4.03  4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0   0   1   5   9  4.53  398/1528  4.53 4.35  4.12 4.00  4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   1   1   0   5   7   2  3.60 1430/1650  4.24 4.06  4.22 4.28  3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   1   2  12   1  3.81 1623/1667  4.36 4.50  4.67 4.61  3.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0   0   0   2  10  4.83  151/1626  4.42 4.14  4.11 4.07  4.85


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4   0   0   0   0   4   8  4.67  673/1559  4.49 4.32  4.46 4.47  4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   5   0   0   0   0   1  10  4.91  596/1560  4.83 4.73  4.72 4.68  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0   0   0   0   3   9  4.75  366/1549  4.59 4.33  4.31 4.32  4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4   0   0   0   0   4   8  4.67  520/1546  4.48 4.26  4.32 4.32  4.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 2  0   0   1   3   6  4.50  326/1323  4.03 3.76  4.00 3.91  4.40


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0   0   1   0   5   7  4.38  560/1384  4.33 4.28  4.10 3.92  4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0   0   1   0   2  10  4.62  517/1378  4.54 4.47  4.29 4.09  4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  0   0   0   1  12  4.92  225/1378  4.52 4.54  4.31 4.08  4.92
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   2   0   0   3   4   4  4.09  443/ 904  4.17 4.01  4.03 3.94  4.09
```

                              Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                  Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    10      0.00-0.99    0      A   12      Required for Majors  11   Graduate     0      Major        0
 28-55     1      1.00-1.99    0      B    2
 56-83     1      2.00-2.99    5      C    0      General               0   Under-grad  16      Non-major   16
 84-150    0      3.00-3.49    2      D    0
 Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    3      F    0      Electives             0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                               responses to be significant
                                      I    0      Other                 4
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0501                University of Maryland                           Page  720
Title       COMPOSITION                         Baltimore County                             AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   HAZELL, ERIC                         Spring 2008                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   25
Questionnaires: 18                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  1  1 16  4.83  271/1670  4.24 4.16  4.31 4.23  4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  1 16  4.94  104/1666  4.40 4.21  4.27 4.30  4.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   4  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1406  4.41 4.42  4.32 4.31  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  0 17  5.00    1/1615  4.44 4.31  4.24 4.17  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  0  0  0  1 16  4.94   79/1566  4.11 4.16  4.07 4.03  4.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 18  5.00    1/1528  4.53 4.35  4.12 4.00  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  1  2 15  4.78  255/1650  4.24 4.06  4.22 4.28  4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  8  9  4.53 1142/1667  4.36 4.50  4.67 4.61  4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 0 3 11  4.79  183/1626  4.42 4.14  4.11 4.07  4.79


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  1 16  4.94  166/1559  4.49 4.32  4.46 4.47  4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  0 17  5.00    1/1560  4.83 4.73  4.72 4.68  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  0 17  5.00    1/1549  4.59 4.33  4.31 4.32  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  0  1 16  4.94  139/1546  4.48 4.26  4.32 4.32  4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 0 0 1 1 13  4.80  156/1323  4.03 3.76  4.00 3.91  4.80


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 1 14  4.93  118/1384  4.33 4.28  4.10 3.92  4.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 15  5.00    1/1378  4.54 4.47  4.29 4.09  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 0 15  5.00    1/1378  4.52 4.54  4.31 4.08  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   1  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/ 904  4.17 4.01  4.03 3.94  5.00


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 16   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 232  **** ****  4.19 4.25  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 239  **** ****  4.21 4.35  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 230  **** ****  4.44 4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          16   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 231  **** ****  4.31 4.45  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 218  **** ****  4.18 4.47  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/  87  **** 4.83  4.65 4.67  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/  79  **** 4.38  4.64 4.72  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/  75  **** 4.50  4.57 4.46  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   16   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  79  **** 4.00  4.45 4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               16   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  80  **** 4.33  3.97 3.99  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/  41  **** ****  4.50 3.91  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/  38  **** ****  4.19 4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      16   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  38  **** ****  4.62 4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  16   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  39  **** ****  4.27 4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  31  **** ****  4.47 4.28  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/  28  **** ****  4.64 4.59  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   16   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  16  **** ****  4.67 4.83  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     16   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  27  **** ****  4.54 4.46  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      16   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  10  **** ****  4.84 4.75  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    16   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/   6  **** ****  4.92 4.83  ****
```

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 18   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   3   0.00-0.99   0   A   9   Required for Majors 7   Graduate   1   Major   0
 28-55   3   1.00-1.99   0   B   2
 56-83   0   2.00-2.99   0   C   2   General   0   Under-grad 17   Non-major 18
 84-150   0   3.00-3.49   1   D   0
 Grad.   1   3.50-4.00   2   F   0   Electives   1   #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P   0   responses to be significant
                                            I   0   Other   4
                                            ?   0

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0601              University of Maryland                                Page  721
Title      COMPOSITION                        Baltimore County                                  AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   WALTERS, APRIL                      Spring 2008                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    21
Questionnaires:  17                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
          General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0   0   6   6   5  3.94 1292/1670  4.24  4.16  4.31  4.23  3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   1   0   5   6   5  3.82 1370/1666  4.40  4.21  4.27  4.30  3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   8   0   1   2   2   4  4.00 1057/1406  4.41  4.42  4.32  4.31  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   2  10   5  4.18  962/1615  4.44  4.31  4.24  4.17  4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   1   3   7   3   3  3.24 1415/1566  4.11  4.16  4.07  4.03  3.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   0   4   6   7  4.18  778/1528  4.53  4.35  4.12  4.00  4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0   0   5   4   8  4.18  997/1650  4.24  4.06  4.22  4.28  4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0   0   0   0  11   5  4.31 1326/1667  4.36  4.50  4.67  4.61  4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0  0   0   6   5   1  3.58 1354/1626  4.42  4.14  4.11  4.07  3.58


          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2   0   0   0   2   7   6  4.27 1150/1559  4.49  4.32  4.46  4.47  4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2   0   0   0   1   3  11  4.67 1090/1560  4.83  4.73  4.72  4.68  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0  0   0   3   4   8  4.33  900/1549  4.59  4.33  4.31  4.32  4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2   0   0   0   6   3   6  4.00 1139/1546  4.48  4.26  4.32  4.32  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 1  0   0   4   6   3  3.92  794/1323  4.03  3.76  4.00  3.91  3.92


          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0  0   0   4   3   2  3.78  987/1384  4.33  4.28  4.10  3.92  3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0  1   1   2   2   3  3.56 1174/1378  4.54  4.47  4.29  4.09  3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0  0   3   2   4  4.11  942/1378  4.52  4.54  4.31  4.08  4.11
4. Were special techniques successful                 8   1   0   2   2   1   3  3.63  689/ 904  4.17  4.01  4.03  3.94  3.63


          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 15   1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 232  ****  ****  4.19  4.25  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15 0 0 0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/ 239  ****  ****  4.21  4.35  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 15 1 0  0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 230  ****  ****  4.44  4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          15   1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 231  ****  ****  4.31  4.45  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 15  1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 218  ****  ****  4.18  4.47  ****


          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15 1 0  0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  87  ****  4.83  4.65  4.67  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15 0 0 0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/  79  ****  4.38  4.64  4.72  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15 0 0  0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/  75  ****  4.50  4.57  4.46  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   15   0   0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/  79  ****  4.00  4.45  4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               15   0   0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/  80  ****  4.33  3.97  3.99  ****


          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15 0  0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50  3.91  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15 0  0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.19  4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      15   0   0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.62  4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  15   0   0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.27  4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 15 0  0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.47  4.28  ****


          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 15 0 0  0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64  4.59  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   15   1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67  4.83  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     15   0   0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54  4.46  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      15   1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84  4.75  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    15   1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/   6  ****  ****  4.92  4.83  ****
```

                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   8   0.00-0.99   0   A   7   Required for Majors   8   Graduate   0   Major   0
28-55   0   1.00-1.99   1   B   5
56-83   1   2.00-2.99   3   C   2   General   0   Under-grad   17   Non-major   17
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
                                            P   0   responses to be significant
                                            I   0   Other   5
                                            ?   0

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0801             University of Maryland                            Page  722
Title          COMPOSITION                 Baltimore County                                 AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    HAZELL, ERIC    (Instr. A)      Spring 2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    25
Questionnaires: 19                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                 Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                     NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank       Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0   0   1   1   2  14  4.61  544/1670   4.24  4.16  4.31  4.23  4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0   0   0   1   1  16  4.83  233/1666   4.40  4.21  4.27  4.30  4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    2  11   0   0   0   1   5  4.83  240/1406   4.41  4.42  4.32  4.31  4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   0   0   0   0   3  15  4.83  224/1615   4.44  4.31  4.24  4.17  4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   1   1   0   2   2  12  4.41  480/1566   4.11  4.16  4.07  4.03  4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0  0   0   1   2  14  4.76  211/1528   4.53  4.35  4.12  4.00  4.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0   0   0   0   2  16  4.89  173/1650   4.24  4.06  4.22  4.28  4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0   0   1  12   5  4.22 1388/1667   4.36  4.50  4.67  4.61  4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1  0   0   1   2  11  4.71  239/1626   4.42  4.14  4.11  4.07  4.80


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0   0   0   3   2  13  4.56  834/1559   4.49  4.32  4.46  4.47  4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   2   1  16  4.74  985/1560   4.83  4.73  4.72  4.68  4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   1   0   3  15  4.68  463/1549   4.59  4.33  4.31  4.32  4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0   1   0   4  14  4.63  557/1546   4.48  4.26  4.32  4.32  4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  9   0   0   1   0   8  4.78  172/1323   4.03  3.76  4.00  3.91  4.70


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0   0   0   2   3  12  4.59  384/1384   4.33  4.28  4.10  3.92  4.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0   0   0   0   1  16  4.94  146/1378   4.54  4.47  4.29  4.09  4.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  1   1   1   0  14  4.47  682/1378   4.52  4.54  4.31  4.08  4.47
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   7   0   0   1   0   9  4.80  128/ 904   4.17  4.01  4.03  3.94  4.80


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  16   1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 232   ****  ****  4.19  4.25  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 0  0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/ 239   ****  ****  4.21  4.35  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 2  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 230   ****  ****  4.44  4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           16   1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 231   ****  ****  4.31  4.45  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  15   2   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 218   ****  ****  4.18  4.47  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/  87   ****  4.83  4.65  4.67  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16  0  0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/  79   ****  4.38  4.64  4.72  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/  75   ****  4.50  4.57  4.46  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     16   1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  79   ****  4.00  4.45  4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 16   1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  80   ****  4.33  3.97  3.99  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  18   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  41   ****  ****  4.50  3.91  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  18   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  38   ****  ****  4.19  4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        18   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  38   ****  ****  4.62  4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    18   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  39   ****  ****  4.27  4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  18   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  31   ****  ****  4.47  4.28  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  28   ****  ****  4.64  4.59  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     18   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  16   ****  ****  4.67  4.83  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       18   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  27   ****  ****  4.54  4.46  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        18   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  10   ****  ****  4.84  4.75  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      18   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/   6   ****  ****  4.92  4.83  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
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			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0801           University of Maryland                          Page  723
Title      COMPOSITION                      Baltimore County                           AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  HAZELL, ERIC    (Instr. B)       Spring 2008                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   25
Questionnaires:  19              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
         Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
         General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0  0  1  1   2  14  4.61   544/1670  4.24 4.16  4.31 4.23  4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  1   1  16  4.83   233/1666  4.40 4.21  4.27 4.30  4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2  11  0  0  0   1   5  4.83   240/1406  4.41 4.42  4.32 4.31  4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0   3  15  4.83   224/1615  4.44 4.31  4.24 4.17  4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1  1  0  2   2  12  4.41   480/1566  4.11 4.16  4.07 4.03  4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 1   2  14  4.76   211/1528  4.53 4.35  4.12 4.00  4.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  0   2  16  4.89   173/1650  4.24 4.06  4.22 4.28  4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  1  12   5  4.22  1388/1667  4.36 4.50  4.67 4.61  4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 0 0 0 0   1   8  4.89   126/1626  4.42 4.14  4.11 4.07  4.80


         Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        9   0  0  0  1   2   7  4.60   772/1559  4.49 4.32  4.46 4.47  4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   8   0  0  0  1   0  10  4.82   829/1560  4.83 4.73  4.72 4.68  4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 9  0  0  0  0   2   8  4.80   294/1549  4.59 4.33  4.31 4.32  4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     9   0  0  0  0   1   9  4.90   231/1546  4.48 4.26  4.32 4.32  4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9  2  0  0  1   1   6  4.63   260/1323  4.03 3.76  4.00 3.91  4.70


         Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  2   3  12  4.59   384/1384  4.33 4.28  4.10 3.92  4.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  0   1  16  4.94   146/1378  4.54 4.47  4.29 4.09  4.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1  1  1   0  14  4.47   682/1378  4.52 4.54  4.31 4.08  4.47
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   7  0  0  1   0   9  4.80   128/ 904  4.17 4.01  4.03 3.94  4.80


         Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  16  1  0  0  0   0   2  5.00  ****/ 232  **** ****  4.19 4.25  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 0 0  0   1   1  4.50  ****/ 239  **** ****  4.21 4.35  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 2 0 0  0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 230  **** ****  4.44 4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           16  1  0  0  0   0   2  5.00  ****/ 231  **** ****  4.31 4.45  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  15  2  0  0  0   0   2  5.00  ****/ 218  **** ****  4.18 4.47  ****


         Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16  0  0  0  0   0   3  5.00  ****/  87  **** 4.83  4.65 4.67  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 0  0   0   3  5.00  ****/  79  **** 4.38  4.64 4.72  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16  0  0  0  0   0   3  5.00  ****/  75  **** 4.50  4.57 4.46  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    16  1  0  0  0   0   2  5.00  ****/  79  **** 4.00  4.45 4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                16  1  0  0  0   0   2  5.00  ****/  80  **** 4.33  3.97 3.99  ****


         Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  18  0  0  0  0   0   1  5.00  ****/  41  **** ****  4.50 3.91  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  18  0  0  0  0   0   1  5.00  ****/  38  **** ****  4.19 4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        18  0  0  0  0   0   1  5.00  ****/  38  **** ****  4.62 4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    18  0  0  0  0   0   1  5.00  ****/  39  **** ****  4.27 4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  18  0  0  0  0   0   1  5.00  ****/  31  **** ****  4.47 4.28  ****


         Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18  0  0  0  0   0   1  5.00  ****/  28  **** ****  4.64 4.59  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     18  0  0  0  0   0   1  5.00  ****/  16  **** ****  4.67 4.83  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       18  0  0  0  0   0   1  5.00  ****/  27  **** ****  4.54 4.46  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        18  0  0  0  0   0   1  5.00  ****/  10  **** ****  4.84 4.75  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      18  0  0  0  0   0   1  5.00  ****/   6  **** ****  4.92 4.83  ****
```

                                             Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   7   0.00-0.99   0   A   7   Required for Majors 12   Graduate   0   Major   0
 28-55   1   1.00-1.99   0   B   9
 56-83   1   2.00-2.99   3   C   1   General   0   Under-grad   19   Non-major   19
 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
                                          P   0   responses to be significant
                                          I   0   Other   4
                                          ?   0

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0901                  University of Maryland                                    Page  724
Title      COMPOSITION                           Baltimore County                                       AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   KIDD, KATHLEEN                        Spring 2008                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    21
Questionnaires:  17                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
          General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   2   2   9   4  3.88 1358/1670  4.24  4.16  4.31  4.23  3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   2   7   8  4.35  846/1666  4.40  4.21  4.27  4.30  4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   5   0   0   2   1   9  4.58  515/1406  4.41  4.42  4.32  4.31  4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   3   3  11  4.47  592/1615  4.44  4.31  4.24  4.17  4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2   0   1   0   9   5  4.20  706/1566  4.11  4.16  4.07  4.03  4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0   0   1   6   9  4.50  421/1528  4.53  4.35  4.12  4.00  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   1   3   4   8  4.19  985/1650  4.24  4.06  4.22  4.28  4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0   4  12  4.75  922/1667  4.36  4.50  4.67  4.61  4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 1  0   1   1   5   2  3.89 1143/1626  4.42  4.14  4.11  4.07  3.89


          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0   0   0   4   3   7  4.21 1185/1559  4.49  4.32  4.46  4.47  4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   4   0   0   0   0   4   9  4.69 1054/1560  4.83  4.73  4.72  4.68  4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0   0   0   1   1  11  4.77  352/1549  4.59  4.33  4.31  4.32  4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4   0   0   1   1   4   7  4.31  949/1546  4.48  4.26  4.32  4.32  4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0  2   0   7   1   3  3.23 1132/1323  4.03  3.76  4.00  3.91  3.23


          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0   0   2   1   8   3  3.86  953/1384  4.33  4.28  4.10  3.92  3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0   0   0   1   9   4  4.21  884/1378  4.54  4.47  4.29  4.09  4.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  0   0   2   8   4  4.14  926/1378  4.52  4.54  4.31  4.08  4.14
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   7   1   1   2   2   1  3.14  812/ 904  4.17  4.01  4.03  3.94  3.14


          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  12  1   0   0   0   2   2  4.50 ****/ 232  ****  ****  4.19  4.25  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 0   0   0   2   2  4.50 ****/ 239  ****  ****  4.21  4.35  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 0  0   0   0   2   2  4.50 ****/ 230  ****  ****  4.44  4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           13  0   0   0   0   2   2  4.50 ****/ 231  ****  ****  4.31  4.45  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13  1   0   0   0   2   1  4.33 ****/ 218  ****  ****  4.18  4.47  ****


          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 14 1  0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  87  ****  4.83  4.65  4.67  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15 0 0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  79  ****  4.38  4.64  4.72  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15 0  0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  75  ****  4.50  4.57  4.46  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    15  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  79  ****  4.00  4.45  4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                15  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  80  ****  4.33  3.97  3.99  ****


          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50  3.91  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.19  4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       15  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.62  4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   15  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.27  4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 15  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.47  4.28  ****


          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64  4.59  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    16  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67  4.83  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      16  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54  4.46  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       16  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84  4.75  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     16  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/   6  ****  ****  4.92  4.83  ****
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0901                    University of Maryland                          Page  724
Title            COMPOSITION                          Baltimore County                          AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:      KIDD, KATHLEEN                          Spring 2008                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      21
Questionnaires:  17                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     3        0.00-0.99   0        A    7        Required for Majors  11    Graduate     0      Major        0
28-55     2        1.00-1.99   0        B    7
56-83     0        2.00-2.99   1        C    1        General               0    Under-grad  17      Non-major   17
84-150    0        3.00-3.49   2        D    0
Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   0        F    0        Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other                 6
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 110  0101           University of Maryland                                    Page  725
Title        COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN         Baltimore County                                     AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   COLLINS, ELSA T               Spring 2008                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   25
Questionnaires: 23                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0   0   1   0   6  15  4.59  567/1670   4.59 4.16  4.31 4.23  4.59
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0   0   1   1   3  17  4.64  452/1666   4.64 4.21  4.27 4.30  4.64
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   4   0   1   0   4  13  4.61  483/1406   4.61 4.42  4.32 4.31  4.61
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   0   1   1   4   4  12  4.14 1000/1615   4.14 4.31  4.24 4.17  4.14
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0   1   0   2   5  14  4.41  491/1566   4.41 4.16  4.07 4.03  4.41
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0   0   1   1   5  14  4.52  406/1528   4.52 4.35  4.12 4.00  4.52
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0   1   0   3   6  11  4.24  926/1650   4.24 4.06  4.22 4.28  4.24
 8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0   0   0   0  22  5.00    1/1667   5.00 4.50  4.67 4.61  5.00
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1   0   0   1   7  11  4.53  387/1626   4.53 4.14  4.11 4.07  4.53


             Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0   0   0   1   2  19  4.82  419/1559   4.82 4.32  4.46 4.47  4.82
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0   0   0   0   3  19  4.86  699/1560   4.86 4.73  4.72 4.68  4.86
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   0   0   0   7  15  4.68  463/1549   4.68 4.33  4.31 4.32  4.68
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0   0   0   1   4  17  4.73  445/1546   4.73 4.26  4.32 4.32  4.73
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  3   2   0   3   5   8  3.94  768/1323   3.94 3.76  4.00 3.91  3.94


             Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10  0   0   0   1   3   9  4.62  364/1384   4.62 4.28  4.10 3.92  4.62
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10  0   0   0   1   4   8  4.54  579/1378   4.54 4.47  4.29 4.09  4.54
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0   0   0   0   5   7  4.58  602/1378   4.58 4.54  4.31 4.08  4.58
 4. Were special techniques successful                   10  0   1   0   2   3   7  4.15  421/ 904   4.15 4.01  4.03 3.94  4.15


             Laboratory
 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   20  0   1   0   0   1   1  3.33 ****/ 232   **** ****  4.19 4.25  ****
 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 20 0  0   0   1   1   1  4.00 ****/ 239   **** ****  4.21 4.35  ****
 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 21 0   1   0   1   0   0  2.00 ****/ 230   **** ****  4.44 4.58  ****
 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            21  0   1   0   0   1   0  2.50 ****/ 231   **** ****  4.31 4.45  ****
 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  21  0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/ 218   **** ****  4.18 4.47  ****


             Seminar
 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  87   **** 4.83  4.65 4.67  ****
 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 22 0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  79   **** 4.38  4.64 4.72  ****
 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 22  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  75   **** 4.50  4.57 4.46  ****
 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     22  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  79   **** 4.00  4.45 4.59  ****
 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 22  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  80   **** 4.33  3.97 3.99  ****


             Field Work
 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  21  0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  41   **** ****  4.50 3.91  ****
 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria   22  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  38   **** ****  4.19 4.07  ****
 3. Was the instructor available for consultation        22  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  38   **** ****  4.62 4.63  ****
 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    22  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  39   **** ****  4.27 4.42  ****
 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  22  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  31   **** ****  4.47 4.28  ****


             Self  Paced
 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  28   **** ****  4.64 4.59  ****
 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     22  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  16   **** ****  4.67 4.83  ****
 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       22  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  27   **** ****  4.54 4.46  ****
 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        22  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  10   **** ****  4.84 4.75  ****
 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      22  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/   6   **** ****  4.92 4.83  ****
```

Title   COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN   Baltimore County   AUG 6, 2008
Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T   Spring 2008   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 23   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 210  0101              University of Maryland                              Page  726
Title        INTRODUCTION TO LIT                Baltimore County                              AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  MCGURRIN JR, AN                     Spring 2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     51
Questionnaires:  24               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  4  3  5  9  3  3.17 1607/1670  3.49 4.16  4.31 4.32  3.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  2  4 10  1  7  3.29 1573/1666  3.46 4.21  4.27 4.27  3.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1   6  1  2  3  4  7  3.82 1175/1406  3.83 4.42  4.32 4.39  3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   4  2  3  6  5  4  3.30 1519/1615  3.50 4.31  4.24 4.29  3.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0  2  1  5  7  9  3.83 1078/1566  4.05 4.16  4.07 4.00  3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 3 5 9 6  3.67 1202/1528  3.50 4.35  4.12 4.11  3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   1  3  6  5  5  4  3.04 1575/1650  3.28 4.06  4.22 4.20  3.04
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  6 11  7  0  3.04 1661/1667  3.51 4.50  4.67 4.64  3.04
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 4 9 4 2 3.10 1529/1626  3.43 4.14  4.11 4.06  3.10


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  2  4  8  6  4  3.25 1499/1559  3.63 4.32  4.46 4.40  3.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  3  2  6 13  4.21 1424/1560  4.46 4.73  4.72 4.73  4.21
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  0  5  7  6  5  3.48 1401/1549  3.74 4.33  4.31 4.25  3.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   1  5  3  6  2  7  3.13 1463/1546  3.61 4.26  4.32 4.30  3.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 17 1 1 1 0 1  2.75 ****/1323  2.70 3.76  4.00 4.08  ****


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 3 1 3 1  3.25 1200/1384  3.92 4.28  4.10 4.07  3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16 0 1 2 0 2 3  3.50 1193/1378  4.01 4.47  4.29 4.25  3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 0 1 0 2 5  4.38  777/1378  4.50 4.54  4.31 4.26  4.38
4. Were special techniques successful                 16   4  2  2  0  0  0  1.50 ****/ 904  4.32 4.01  4.03 4.01  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     3        0.00-0.99    0      A    9      Required for Majors   5     Graduate     0      Major        0
  28-55     1        1.00-1.99    0      B   10
  56-83     2        2.00-2.99    3      C    0      General               1     Under-grad  24      Non-major   24
  84-150    3        3.00-3.49    4      D    0
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00    7      F    0      Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other                11
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 210  0201            University of Maryland                              Page 727
Title       INTRODUCTION TO LIT               Baltimore County                             AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    FINDLAY, JOANNA                 Spring 2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    52
Questionnaires:  38               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                 NR NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  1  4 10  9  14  3.82 1407/1670  3.49 4.16  4.31 4.32  3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  2 17 12   7  3.63 1465/1666  3.46 4.21  4.27 4.27  3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  1  5  5 15  12  3.84 1164/1406  3.83 4.42  4.32 4.39  3.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  1  2  2 12 10  11  3.70 1356/1615  3.50 4.31  4.24 4.29  3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  2  2 14  19  4.26  632/1566  4.05 4.16  4.07 4.00  4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 5 5  7 14   7  3.34 1362/1528  3.50 4.35  4.12 4.11  3.34
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  1  8  9 10  10  3.53 1454/1650  3.28 4.06  4.22 4.20  3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  1  3 30   4  3.97 1549/1667  3.51 4.50  4.67 4.64  3.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 12 0 0 0 10 12  4  3.77 1247/1626  3.43 4.14  4.11 4.06  3.77


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4  0  1  1  5 17  10  4.00 1280/1559  3.63 4.32  4.46 4.40  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   4  0  0  0  2  6  26  4.71 1042/1560  4.46 4.73  4.72 4.73  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5 0  0  2  7 13  11  4.00 1146/1549  3.74 4.33  4.31 4.25  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4  0  1  2  6  9  16  4.09 1110/1546  3.61 4.26  4.32 4.30  4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 4 9  3  7  3   5  2.70 1256/1323  2.70 3.76  4.00 4.08  2.70


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 1  0  1  5  20  4.59  378/1384  3.92 4.28  4.10 4.07  4.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 0  0  2  9  16  4.52  595/1378  4.01 4.47  4.29 4.25  4.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0 0  3  4  20  4.63  570/1378  4.50 4.54  4.31 4.26  4.63
4. Were special techniques successful                  12  4  0  0  4  7  11  4.32  339/ 904  4.32 4.01  4.03 4.01  4.32


                Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0 0 0  1  0   0  3.00 ****/ 239  **** ****  4.21 4.33  ****


                Seminar
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    37  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  79  **** 4.00  4.45 3.95  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                37  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00 ****/  80  **** 4.33  3.97 4.30  ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 37  0  1  0  0  0   0  1.00 ****/  41  **** ****  4.50 2.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 37  0  1  0  0  0   0  1.00 ****/  38  **** ****  4.19 2.50  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       37  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  38  **** ****  4.62 4.50  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   37  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  39  **** ****  4.27 4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 37  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  31  **** ****  4.47 4.00  ****


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 36 0 0  0  0  0   2  5.00 ****/  28  **** ****  4.64 ****  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    36  0  0  0  0  0   2  5.00 ****/  16  **** ****  4.67 ****  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      36  0  0  0  0  1   1  4.50 ****/  27  **** ****  4.54 ****  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       36  0  0  0  0  1   1  4.50 ****/  10  **** ****  4.84 ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     36  0  0  1  0  0   1  3.50 ****/   6  **** ****  4.92 ****  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type               Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     2      0.00-0.99    0      A   8      Required for Majors  12      Graduate    0      Major        0
 28-55     4      1.00-1.99    0      B  14
 56-83     4      2.00-2.99    1      C   9      General               3      Under-grad 38      Non-major   38
 84-150    2      3.00-3.49   10      D   0
 Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    3      F   0      Electives             1      #### - Means there are not enough
```

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 226  0101              University of Maryland                        Page  728
Title        ENGLISH GRAMMAR USAGE          Baltimore County                              AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  HARRIS, LINDA R                Spring 2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     40
Questionnaires: 28                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                               Frequencies      Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  4  6  1  9  8  3.39 1568/1670  3.39  4.16  4.31 4.32  3.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  4  2  6 16  4.21 1015/1666  4.21  4.21  4.27 4.27  4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   2  1  2  1  4 18  4.38  739/1406  4.38  4.42  4.32 4.39  4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  1  3  9  4 10  3.70 1356/1615  3.70  4.31  4.24 4.29  3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   0  8  3  4  2 11  3.18 1437/1566  3.18  4.16  4.07 4.00  3.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1   0  4  6  2  4 11  3.44 1306/1528  3.44  4.35  4.12 4.11  3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0  1  2  4  4 15  4.15 1020/1650  4.15  4.06  4.22 4.20  4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   1  2  1  8 13  1  3.40 1656/1667  3.40  4.50  4.67 4.64  3.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3   1  1  3  9  5  6  3.50 1384/1626  3.50  4.14  4.11 4.06  3.50


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0  2  3  6  7  7  3.56 1453/1559  3.56  4.32  4.46 4.40  3.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0  0  2  5  5 13  4.16 1438/1560  4.16  4.73  4.72 4.73  4.16
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0  2  4  5  4 10  3.64 1351/1549  3.64  4.33  4.31 4.25  3.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   1  0  6  1  6 11  3.92 1222/1546  3.92  4.26  4.32 4.30  3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6  17  1  0  1  0  3  3.80 ****/1323  ****  3.76  4.00 4.08  ****


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12   0  2  4  2  2  6  3.38 1154/1384  3.38  4.28  4.10 4.07  3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11   0  3  3  2  0  9  3.53 1185/1378  3.53  4.47  4.29 4.25  3.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12   0  2  2  3  2  7  3.63 1159/1378  3.63  4.54  4.31 4.26  3.63
4. Were special techniques successful                  12   8  2  1  0  1  4  3.50  718/ 904  3.50  4.01  4.03 4.01  3.50


             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  26   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 232  ****  ****  4.19 4.35  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 27   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 239  ****  ****  4.21 4.33  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 27   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 230  ****  ****  4.44 4.61  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           27   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 231  ****  ****  4.31 4.52  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 27   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 218  ****  ****  4.18 4.25  ****


             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 26   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  87  ****  4.83  4.65 5.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 27   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  4.38  4.64 4.75  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 27   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  75  ****  4.50  4.57 4.25  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    27   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  4.00  4.45 3.95  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                27   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  4.33  3.97 4.30  ****


             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 27   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50 2.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 27   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.19 2.50  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       27   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.62 4.50  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   27   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.27 4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 27   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.47 4.00  ****


             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 26   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64 ****  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    26   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67 ****  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      26   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54 ****  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       26   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84 ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     26   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/   6  ****  ****  4.92 ****  ****
```

Title   ENGLISH GRAMMAR USAGE
Baltimore County
Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R
Spring 2008
Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 28
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	23	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	28	Non-major	22
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: ENGL 241A 0101            University of Maryland                        Page  729
Title       KING ARTHUR OF BRITAIN        Baltimore County                           AUG  6, 2008
Instructor: ORGELFINGER, GA              Spring 2008                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    47
Questionnaires:  36            Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   3   2  15  16  4.22 1027/1670  4.22  4.16  4.31  4.32  4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   1   2   5  17  11  3.97 1234/1666  3.97  4.21  4.27  4.27  3.97
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   5  14  17  4.33  799/1406  4.33  4.42  4.32  4.39  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2   1   0   6  17  10  4.03 1072/1615  4.03  4.31  4.24  4.29  4.03
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0   0   1   1   4  29  4.74  234/1566  4.74  4.16  4.07  4.00  4.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  1  2  3  9  13   7  3.59 1241/1528  3.59  4.35  4.12  4.11  3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   3   3   9  13   8  3.56 1445/1650  3.56  4.06  4.22  4.20  3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   6  30  4.83  805/1667  4.83  4.50  4.67  4.64  4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5  0  0  1  3  17  10  4.16  831/1626  4.16  4.14  4.11  4.06  4.16


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0   0   0   0   6  28  4.82  403/1559  4.82  4.32  4.46  4.40  4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0   0   0   0   0  34  5.00    1/1560  5.00  4.73  4.72  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0   0   0   4  11  18  4.42  789/1549  4.42  4.33  4.31  4.25  4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0   1   0   2   9  22  4.50  715/1546  4.50  4.26  4.32  4.30  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  0  0  1  7  13  12  4.09  659/1323  4.09  3.76  4.00  4.08  4.09


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10  0  1  1  7   9   8  3.85  957/1384  3.85  4.28  4.10  4.07  3.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10  0  2  0  5   8  11  4.00  970/1378  4.00  4.47  4.29  4.25  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0  1  0  1   9  15  4.42  731/1378  4.42  4.54  4.31  4.26  4.42
4. Were special techniques successful                    9   2  0  1  7  10   7  3.92  548/ 904  3.92  4.01  4.03  4.01  3.92


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 35  0  0  0  0   1   0  4.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64  ****  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     35  0  0  0  0   1   0  4.00 ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67  ****  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       35  0  0  0  0   0   1  5.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54  ****  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        35  0  0  0  0   1   0  4.00 ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84  ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      35  0  0  0  0   0   1  5.00 ****/   6  ****  ****  4.92  ****  ****


                                 Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons               Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      5       0.00-0.99   0     A   12     Required for Majors  12    Graduate      0     Major       10
  28-55      8       1.00-1.99   0     B   17                                Under-grad   36     Non-major   26
  56-83      3       2.00-2.99   3     C    5     General              12
  84-150     4       3.00-3.49   5     D    0
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00  13     F    0     Electives             4    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0     Other                 9
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 243  0101            University of Maryland                                     Page  730
Title        CURRENTS IN AMERICAN L          Baltimore County                                      AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   BENSON, LINDA K                  Spring 2008                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   39
Questionnaires: 24                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0  0  1  3  7 12  4.30  943/1670  4.30  4.16  4.31 4.32  4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  1  7  3 13  4.17 1070/1666  4.17  4.21  4.27 4.27  4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   1  0  1  2  6 13  4.41  715/1406  4.41  4.42  4.32 4.39  4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   0  1  0  5  5 12  4.17  962/1615  4.17  4.31  4.24 4.29  4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  2  1  4 17  4.50  389/1566  4.50  4.16  4.07 4.00  4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  1  0  2  6 14  4.39  570/1528  4.39  4.35  4.12 4.11  4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  1  1  2  5 15  4.33  806/1650  4.33  4.06  4.22 4.20  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   1  0  0  0  8 15  4.65 1032/1667  4.65  4.50  4.67 4.64  4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1  0  0  4  8  8  4.20  797/1626  4.20  4.14  4.11 4.06  4.20


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3   0  0  3  0  5 13  4.33 1092/1559  4.33  4.32  4.46 4.40  4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    4   0  0  1  1  1 17  4.70 1054/1560  4.70  4.73  4.72 4.73  4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5   0  2  0  1  5 11  4.21 1010/1549  4.21  4.33  4.31 4.25  4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      5   1  1  2  0  2 13  4.33  919/1546  4.33  4.26  4.32 4.30  4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5  1  4  0  6  3  5  3.28 1117/1323  3.28  3.76  4.00 4.08  3.28


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7   0  1  1  2  3 10  4.18  730/1384  4.18  4.28  4.10 4.07  4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0  1  0  2  3 12  4.39  740/1378  4.39  4.47  4.29 4.25  4.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7  0  0  0  2  3 12  4.59  602/1378  4.59  4.54  4.31 4.26  4.59
4. Were special techniques successful                   7   0  0  1  1  3 12  4.53  234/ 904  4.53  4.01  4.03 4.01  4.53


           Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 23 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 239  ****  ****  4.21 4.33  ****


           Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21  2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  87  ****  4.83  4.65 5.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  79  ****  4.38  4.64 4.75  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21  1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  75  ****  4.50  4.57 4.25  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     21  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/  79  ****  4.00  4.45 3.95  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 21  0  0  1  0  0  2  4.00 ****/  80  ****  4.33  3.97 4.30  ****


           Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  22  0  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50 2.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  21  0  0  1  0  0  2  4.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.19 2.50  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        21  1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.62 4.50  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    21  1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.27 4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  22  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.47 4.00  ****


           Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21  0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64 ****  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     21  0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67 ****  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       21  1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54 ****  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	5	Under-grad	24	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: ENGL 250  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  731
Title          INTRO TO SHAKESPEARE         Baltimore County                               AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    ORGELFINGER, GA             Spring 2008                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    22
Questionnaires: 17              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean      Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  4 13  4.76   350/1670   4.76  4.16  4.31 4.32  4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  1  1  6  9  4.35   846/1666   4.35  4.21  4.27 4.27  4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  2  9  6  4.24   892/1406   4.24  4.42  4.32 4.39  4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  1  1  1  4 10  4.24   898/1615   4.24  4.31  4.24 4.29  4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  1  2 14  4.76   218/1566   4.76  4.16  4.07 4.00  4.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  1  2  2 12  4.47   462/1528   4.47  4.35  4.12 4.11  4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  1  9  7  4.35   782/1650   4.35  4.06  4.22 4.20  4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  7 10  4.59  1097/1667   4.59  4.50  4.67 4.64  4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  1  8  7  4.38   595/1626   4.38  4.14  4.11 4.06  4.38


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  0  2 14  4.88   323/1559   4.88  4.32  4.46 4.40  4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  0  0 16  5.00     1/1560   5.00  4.73  4.72 4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  1  4 11  4.63   537/1549   4.63  4.33  4.31 4.25  4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  0  0  2 14  4.88   265/1546   4.88  4.26  4.32 4.30  4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  1  0  0  2  1 10  4.62   266/1323   4.62  3.76  4.00 4.08  4.62


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3   0  0  0  1  3 10  4.64   340/1384   4.64  4.28  4.10 4.07  4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3   0  0  0  0  1 13  4.93   194/1378   4.93  4.47  4.29 4.25  4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0  0  0  0  5  9  4.64   550/1378   4.64  4.54  4.31 4.26  4.64
4. Were special techniques successful                   3   2  0  0  3  4  5  4.17   417/ 904   4.17  4.01  4.03 4.01  4.17

                                      Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 250H 0101          University of Maryland                                    Page  732
Title         INTO TO SHAKESPEARE-HO     Baltimore County                                        AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   ORGELFINGER, GA            Spring 2008                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    7
Questionnaires:  5                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies         Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  0  0  5 5.00    1/1670  5.00  4.16  4.31 4.32  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  1  4 4.80  259/1666  4.80  4.21  4.27 4.27  4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  1  4 4.80  261/1406  4.80  4.42  4.32 4.39  4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  2  3 4.60  446/1615  4.60  4.31  4.24 4.29  4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  0  5 5.00    1/1566  5.00  4.16  4.07 4.00  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  2  3 4.60  346/1528  4.60  4.35  4.12 4.11  4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  1  0  4 4.60  429/1650  4.60  4.06  4.22 4.20  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  2  3 4.60 1082/1667  4.60  4.50  4.67 4.64  4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  0  0  2  3 4.60  324/1626  4.60  4.14  4.11 4.06  4.60


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1559  5.00  4.32  4.46 4.40  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1560  5.00  4.73  4.72 4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1549  5.00  4.33  4.31 4.25  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1546  5.00  4.26  4.32 4.30  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1  0  0  0  2  1 4.33  481/1323  4.33  3.76  4.00 4.08  4.33


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0  0  0  1  0  1 4.00  820/1384  4.00  4.28  4.10 4.07  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1378  5.00  4.47  4.29 4.25  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1378  5.00  4.54  4.31 4.26  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  3  1  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 904  ****  4.01  4.03 4.01  ****


                            Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 271  0101              University of Maryland                           Page  733
Title       INTRO CREAT WRTG-FICTI           Baltimore County                             AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  SAWYERS, SETH A                  Spring 2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    22
Questionnaires: 14                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  4 10  4.71  414/1670  4.71 4.16 4.31 4.32  4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  2 11  4.71  355/1666  4.71 4.21 4.27 4.27  4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  11  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/1406  **** 4.42 4.32 4.39  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   3  0  0  0  1 10  4.91  176/1615  4.91 4.31 4.24 4.29  4.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  0  1  1  3  8  4.38  510/1566  4.38 4.16 4.07 4.00  4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  2 12  4.86  147/1528  4.86 4.35 4.12 4.11  4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   4  1  0  1  3  5  4.10 1079/1650  4.10 4.06 4.22 4.20  4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1667  5.00 4.50 4.67 4.64  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  0  0  7  4  4.36  605/1626  4.36 4.14 4.11 4.06  4.36


                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0  0  0  0  3  8  4.73  572/1559  4.73 4.32 4.46 4.40  4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1560  5.00 4.73 4.72 4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82  284/1549  4.82 4.33 4.31 4.25  4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0  0  0  1  3  7  4.55  667/1546  4.55 4.26 4.32 4.30  4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 10 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1323  **** 3.76 4.00 4.08  ****


                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  221/1384  4.80 4.28 4.10 4.07  4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1378  5.00 4.47 4.29 4.25  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1378  5.00 4.54 4.31 4.26  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   2  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  116/ 904  4.88 4.01 4.03 4.01  4.88


                  Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  87  **** 4.83 4.65 5.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  79  **** 4.38 4.64 4.75  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  75  **** 4.50 4.57 4.25  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    13   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  79  **** 4.00 4.45 3.95  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                13   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  80  **** 4.33 3.97 4.30  ****


                  Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  41  **** **** 4.50 2.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  38  **** **** 4.19 2.50  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       13   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  38  **** **** 4.62 4.50  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   13   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  **** **** 4.27 4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  **** **** 4.47 4.00  ****

                                      Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades        Reasons                Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0      0.00-0.99    0      A     9      Required for Majors  0     Graduate     0      Major       8
 28-55     1      1.00-1.99    0      B     1
 56-83     2      2.00-2.99    1      C     0      General              7     Under-grad  14      Non-major   6
 84-150    3      3.00-3.49    2      D     0
 Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    4      F     0      Electives            2     #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P     0                                responses to be significant
                                      I     0      Other                5
                                      ?     4
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 273  0101                University of Maryland                                  Page  734
Title          INT CREATIVE WTG-POETR              Baltimore County                                 AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    MCGURRIN JR, AN                      Spring 2008                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    23
Questionnaires: 10                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  1  3  3  2  3.40 1566/1670  3.40 4.16  4.31 4.32  3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  2  3  3  1  3.10 1597/1666  3.10 4.21  4.27 4.27  3.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   9  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/1406  **** 4.42  4.32 4.39  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2  0  1  3  3  1  3.50 1448/1615  3.50 4.31  4.24 4.29  3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  2  2  3  2  3.30 1385/1566  3.30 4.16  4.07 4.00  3.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  1  0  3  1  4  3.78 1140/1528  3.78 4.35  4.12 4.11  3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   4  1  2  2  1  0  2.50 1624/1650  2.50 4.06  4.22 4.20  2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  1  1  5  3  0  3.00 1663/1667  3.00 4.50  4.67 4.64  3.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1  1  1  2  3  0  3.00 1534/1626  3.00 4.14  4.11 4.06  3.00


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  2  0  2  5  0  3.11 1514/1559  3.11 4.32  4.46 4.40  3.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  1  0  1  2  5  4.11 1457/1560  4.11 4.73  4.72 4.73  4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  1  1  3  4  0  3.11 1481/1549  3.11 4.33  4.31 4.25  3.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  2  2  1  3  1  2.89 1498/1546  2.89 4.26  4.32 4.30  2.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 8  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/1323  **** 3.76  4.00 4.08  ****


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  1  2  1  4.00  820/1384  4.00 4.28  4.10 4.07  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  1  0  1  2  4.00  970/1378  4.00 4.47  4.29 4.25  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0  0  0  1  2  1  4.00  977/1378  4.00 4.54  4.31 4.26  4.00
```

```
                                           Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 291  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  735
Title         INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY         Baltimore County                             AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   BENSON, LINDA K                  Spring 2008                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   22
Questionnaires: 12                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies      Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  1  2  9  4.67  479/1670  4.14  4.16  4.31  4.32  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  0  0  1  2  8  4.64  452/1666  4.00  4.21  4.27  4.27  4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  10  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/1406  4.31  4.42  4.32  4.39  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1  0  0  1  2  8  4.64  412/1615  4.45  4.31  4.24  4.29  4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  1  3  3  5  4.00  851/1566  3.76  4.16  4.07  4.00  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0  0  3  1  7  4.36  600/1528  4.34  4.35  4.12  4.11  4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  1  2  3  6  4.17 1008/1650  3.60  4.06  4.22  4.20  4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  5  7  4.58 1097/1667  4.59  4.50  4.67  4.64  4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  2  2  6  4.40  563/1626  4.13  4.14  4.11  4.06  4.40


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3   0  0  0  0  3  6  4.67  673/1559  4.20  4.32  4.46  4.40  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1560  4.79  4.73  4.72  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  220/1549  4.42  4.33  4.31  4.25  4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3   0  0  0  1  2  6  4.56  655/1546  4.06  4.26  4.32  4.30  4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  8  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1323  3.33  3.76  4.00  4.08  ****


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0  0  0  1  3  4  4.38  570/1384  4.45  4.28  4.10  4.07  4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1378  4.76  4.47  4.29  4.25  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0  0  0  2  1  5  4.38  777/1378  4.61  4.54  4.31  4.26  4.38
4. Were special techniques successful                   4   2  0  1  1  1  3  4.00  461/ 904  4.03  4.01  4.03  4.01  4.00


             Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 239  ****  ****  4.21  4.33  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 11 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 230  ****  ****  4.44  4.61  ****


             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  87  ****  4.83  4.65  5.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 11 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  79  ****  4.38  4.64  4.75  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     11  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  79  ****  4.00  4.45  3.95  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 11  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  80  ****  4.33  3.97  4.30  ****


             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  11  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50  2.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  11  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  38  ****  ****  4.19  2.50  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        11  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  38  ****  ****  4.62  4.50  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    11  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  39  ****  ****  4.27  4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  11  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  31  ****  ****  4.47  4.00  ****


             Self Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 11  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64  ****  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     11  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67  ****  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       11  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54  ****  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        11  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84  ****  ****
```

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 12   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequency Distribution

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

```
                                                    Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                      NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean   Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  2  2  5   9  4.17 1094/1670  4.14  4.16  4.31 4.32  4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  4  4   9  4.17 1070/1666  4.00  4.21  4.27 4.27  4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  11  0  0  2  1   4  4.29  852/1406  4.31  4.42  4.32 4.39  4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  2  5  11  4.50  552/1615  4.45  4.31  4.24 4.29  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  2  2  1  13  4.39  510/1566  3.76  4.16  4.07 4.00  4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 1  0  1  2  14  4.56  383/1528  4.34  4.35  4.12 4.11  4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  3  5  10  4.39  744/1650  3.60  4.06  4.22 4.20  4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0 10   8  4.44 1216/1667  4.59  4.50  4.67 4.64  4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0  2  8   5  4.20  797/1626  4.13  4.14  4.11 4.06  4.20


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  2  6   8  4.38 1052/1559  4.20  4.32  4.46 4.40  4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  0  3  13  4.81  829/1560  4.79  4.73  4.72 4.73  4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  3  2  11  4.50  683/1549  4.42  4.33  4.31 4.25  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  1  1  2  2  10  4.19 1040/1546  4.06  4.26  4.32 4.30  4.19


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  2  2  11  4.60  372/1384  4.45  4.28  4.10 4.07  4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  1  2  2  10  4.40  718/1378  4.76  4.47  4.29 4.25  4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0  1  1  3  10  4.47  692/1378  4.61  4.54  4.31 4.26  4.47
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   2  0  1  3  3   6  4.08  447/ 904  4.03  4.01  4.03 4.01  4.08
```

                              Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      1       0.00-0.99   0       A   9       Required for Majors   5      Graduate     0      Major        5
28-55      7       1.00-1.99   0       B   7
56-83      2       2.00-2.99   1       C   0       General               3      Under-grad  18      Non-major   13
84-150     1       3.00-3.49   3       D   0
Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   7       F   0       Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0                                    responses to be significant
                                       I   0       Other                 6
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 291  0301           University of Maryland                        Page  737
Title       INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY          Baltimore County                         AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  MABE, MITZI J                   Spring 2008                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    16
Questionnaires:  11              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions            NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1  0  0  1  4  3  2  3.60 1511/1670  4.14  4.16 4.31 4.32  3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1  0  0  3  4  1  2  3.20 1582/1666  4.00  4.21 4.27 4.27  3.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1  7  0  0  1  0  2  4.33  799/1406  4.31  4.42 4.32 4.39  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1  1  0  1  1  2  5  4.22  910/1615  4.45  4.31 4.24 4.29  4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  0  2  0  5  1  1  2.89 1515/1566  3.76  4.16 4.07 4.00  2.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0  0  1  1  3  4  4.11  832/1528  4.34  4.35 4.12 4.11  4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2  1  3  2  2  0  1  2.25 1633/1650  3.60  4.06 4.22 4.20  2.25
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2  1  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  922/1667  4.59  4.50 4.67 4.64  4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  4  3  2  3.78 1240/1626  4.13  4.14 4.11 4.06  3.78


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         4  0  0  2  1  2  2  3.57 1451/1559  4.20  4.32 4.46 4.40  3.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    4  0  0  0  1  1  5  4.57 1188/1560  4.79  4.73 4.72 4.73  4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0  0  0  4  0  3  3.86 1261/1549  4.42  4.33 4.31 4.25  3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      4  0  0  3  1  0  3  3.43 1404/1546  4.06  4.26 4.32 4.30  3.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1  1  2  0  0  3  3.33 1099/1323  3.33  3.76 4.00 4.08  3.33


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  1  3  4  4.38  570/1384  4.45  4.28 4.10 4.07  4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  274/1378  4.76  4.47 4.29 4.25  4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1378  4.61  4.54 4.31 4.26  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   4  0  1  0  1  1  4  4.00  461/ 904  4.03  4.01 4.03 4.01  4.00


           Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  87  ****  4.83 4.65 5.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  4.38 4.64 4.75  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  75  ****  4.50 4.57 4.25  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     10 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  4.00 4.45 3.95  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 10 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  4.33 3.97 4.30  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
                                                  Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                    NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0   0   0   2  11   4  4.12 1150/1670  4.39  4.16  4.31  4.24  4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0   0   4   4   9  4.29  919/1666  4.51  4.21  4.27  4.18  4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0   0   0   5   4   8  4.18  940/1406  4.45  4.42  4.32  4.22  4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0   0   0   5   3   9  4.24  898/1615  4.53  4.31  4.24  4.18  4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   1   2   5   9  4.29  599/1566  4.66  4.16  4.07  4.04  4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0   1   2   5   9  4.29  670/1528  4.51  4.35  4.12  4.07  4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   1   5   3   8  4.06 1107/1650  4.39  4.06  4.22  4.12  4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   3   6   8  4.29 1340/1667  4.71  4.50  4.67  4.67  4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0  0   2   7   7  4.31  659/1626  4.41  4.14  4.11  4.06  4.31

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        5   0   0   1   0   4   8  4.46  946/1559  4.64  4.32  4.46  4.40  4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   5   0   0   0   1   1  11  4.77  929/1560  4.92  4.73  4.72  4.67  4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6  0   0   0   2   4   6  4.33  900/1549  4.56  4.33  4.31  4.25  4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     7   0   0   1   1   1   8  4.45  782/1546  4.63  4.26  4.32  4.24  4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 2  1   0   4   2   3  3.60  990/1323  3.44  3.76  4.00  3.99  3.60

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0   0   1   1   3   5  4.20  712/1384  4.41  4.28  4.10  4.12  4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0   0   0   0   0   9  5.00    1/1378  4.75  4.47  4.29  4.30  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0  0   0   0   1   8  4.89  302/1378  4.82  4.54  4.31  4.33  4.89
4. Were special techniques successful                  9   0   0   0   1   4   4  4.33  328/ 904  3.92  4.01  4.03  4.03  4.33
```

                              Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                     Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0          0.00-0.99    0       A   11          Required for Majors   0     Graduate      0       Major        16
28-55      2          1.00-1.99    0       B    5                                       
56-83      4          2.00-2.99    1       C    1          General               2     Under-grad   18       Non-major     2
84-150     2          3.00-3.49    4       D    0
Grad.      0          3.50-4.00    8       F    0          Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                      responses to be significant
                                           I    0          Other                14
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 301  0201            University of Maryland                        Page  739
Title      ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG              Baltimore County                          AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    SMITH, ORIANNE                    Spring 2008                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    24
Questionnaires:  22                Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank       Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   0   0   6  16  4.73   401/1670   4.39 4.16  4.31 4.24  4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   2   2  18  4.73   344/1666   4.51 4.21  4.27 4.18  4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   5  16  4.68   399/1406   4.45 4.42  4.32 4.22  4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0   0   1   5  16  4.68   357/1615   4.53 4.31  4.24 4.18  4.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   0   2  20  4.91   132/1566   4.66 4.16  4.07 4.04  4.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0   0   0   1   2  19  4.82   167/1528   4.51 4.35  4.12 4.07  4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   0   2   4  16  4.64   395/1650   4.39 4.06  4.22 4.12  4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   2  20  4.91   675/1667   4.71 4.50  4.67 4.67  4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0   0   0   1   4  11  4.63   308/1626   4.41 4.14  4.11 4.06  4.63


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         4   0   0   0   0   2  16  4.89   307/1559   4.64 4.32  4.46 4.40  4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    4   0   0   0   0   0  18  5.00     1/1560   4.92 4.73  4.72 4.67  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4   0   0   0   0   3  15  4.83   266/1549   4.56 4.33  4.31 4.25  4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      4   0   0   0   0   1  17  4.94   139/1546   4.63 4.26  4.32 4.24  4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5  8   3   1   2   1   2  2.78  1245/1323   3.44 3.76  4.00 3.99  2.78


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7   0   0   0   1   1  13  4.80   221/1384   4.41 4.28  4.10 4.12  4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7   0   0   0   0   3  12  4.80   348/1378   4.75 4.47  4.29 4.30  4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7  0   0   0   1   2  12  4.73   460/1378   4.82 4.54  4.31 4.33  4.73
4. Were special techniques successful                   7   5   1   1   2   0   6  3.90   570/ 904   3.92 4.01  4.03 4.03  3.90


                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons               Type               Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0      A   11      Required for Majors   0     Graduate     0      Major       16
 28-55      2      1.00-1.99    0      B    6                                 
 56-83      6      2.00-2.99    0      C    1      General               3     Under-grad  22      Non-major    6
 84-150     1      3.00-3.49    4      D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    7      F    0      Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                17
                                       ?    2
```

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 18   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                                 Frequencies        Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                  NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   1   1   7   9  4.33   902/1670   4.39  4.16  4.31  4.24  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   1   7  10  4.50   622/1666   4.51  4.21  4.27  4.18  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   1   0   1   1   3  11  4.50   597/1406   4.45  4.42  4.32  4.22  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   1   0   0   1   3  12  4.69   357/1615   4.53  4.31  4.24  4.18  4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0   0   0   0   4  13  4.76   218/1566   4.66  4.16  4.07  4.04  4.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0   0   0   2   6   9  4.41   546/1528   4.51  4.35  4.12  4.07  4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0   0   0   1   7   9  4.47   615/1650   4.39  4.06  4.22  4.12  4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0   0   0   1  16  4.94   405/1667   4.71  4.50  4.67  4.67  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0   0   0   3   6   8  4.29   681/1626   4.41  4.14  4.11  4.06  4.29


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         4   0   0   0   0   6   8  4.57   809/1559   4.64  4.32  4.46  4.40  4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    4   0   0   0   0   0  14  5.00     1/1560   4.92  4.73  4.72  4.67  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4   0   0   0   0   7   7  4.50   683/1549   4.56  4.33  4.31  4.25  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      4   0   0   0   0   7   7  4.50   715/1546   4.63  4.26  4.32  4.24  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  0   0   1   4   4   5  3.93   794/1323   3.44  3.76  4.00  3.99  3.93


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5   0   0   0   2   6   5  4.23   683/1384   4.41  4.28  4.10  4.12  4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5   0   0   1   1   2   9  4.46   649/1378   4.75  4.47  4.29  4.30  4.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0   0   0   0   2  11  4.85   344/1378   4.82  4.54  4.31  4.33  4.85
4. Were special techniques successful                   5   0   1   1   5   2   4  3.54   712/ 904   3.92  4.01  4.03  4.03  3.54
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                     Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      3        0.00-0.99    0        A    9         Required for Majors   0        Graduate     0         Major         5
28-55      2        1.00-1.99    0        B    5
56-83      1        2.00-2.99    1        C    2         General               3        Under-grad  18         Non-major    13
84-150     0        3.00-3.49    1        D    0
Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    7        F    0         Electives             0        #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                        responses to be significant
                                          I    0         Other                12
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 303  0101            University of Maryland                             Page  741
Title       ART OF THE ESSAY                Baltimore County                                 AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  FARABAUGH, ROBI                 Spring 2008                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   24
Questionnaires: 16              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions            NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean     Rank     Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0  0  1  4  11  4.63  531/1670  4.63 4.16 4.31 4.24 4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0  0  1  5  10  4.56  542/1666  4.56 4.21 4.27 4.18 4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  14   0  0  0  1   1  4.50 ****/1406  **** 4.42 4.32 4.22 ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   2   0  0  1  6   7  4.43  660/1615  4.43 4.31 4.24 4.18 4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  7   9  4.56  359/1566  4.56 4.16 4.07 4.04 4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 16  5.00    1/1528  5.00 4.35 4.12 4.07 5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0  1  0  6   9  4.44  675/1650  4.44 4.06 4.22 4.12 4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0  0  0  1  15  4.94  472/1667  4.94 4.50 4.67 4.67 4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 1 4  10  4.60  324/1626  4.60 4.14 4.11 4.06 4.60


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       4   0   0  0  0  1  11  4.92  248/1559  4.92 4.32 4.46 4.40 4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3   0   0  0  0  1  12  4.92  477/1560  4.92 4.73 4.72 4.67 4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0  0  0  0  1  12  4.92  161/1549  4.92 4.33 4.31 4.25 4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    4   0   0  0  0  1  11  4.92  208/1546  4.92 4.26 4.32 4.24 4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 10 0 0 0  1   2  4.67 ****/1323  **** 3.76 4.00 3.99 ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0  0  0  0  1  11  4.92  152/1384  4.92 4.28 4.10 4.12 4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0  0  0  0  1  11  4.92  218/1378  4.92 4.47 4.29 4.30 4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 0 12  5.00    1/1378  5.00 4.54 4.31 4.33 5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 4   7   0  0  1  0   4  4.60  202/ 904  4.60 4.01 4.03 4.03 4.60


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                  Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    0      0.00-0.99   0        A   5        Required for Majors  0     Graduate    0      Major       14
  28-55    2      1.00-1.99   0        B   7                                   Under-grad  16     Non-major    2
  56-83    0      2.00-2.99   1        C   0        General              3
  84-150   2      3.00-3.49   3        D   0                                   #### - Means there are not enough
  Grad.    0      3.50-4.00   5        F   0        Electives            0           responses to be significant
                                       P   0
                                       I   0        Other               11
                                       ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 304  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  742
Title        BRIT LIT:MEDIEVAL/RENA          Baltimore County                              AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   FALCO, RAPHAEL                     Spring 2008                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires:  14                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies         Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank       Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   2   7   5  4.21 1038/1670  4.21  4.16  4.31  4.24  4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   3   8   2  3.79 1393/1666  3.79  4.21  4.27  4.18  3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   1   1   7   5  4.14  964/1406  4.14  4.42  4.32  4.22  4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   1   1   2   9  4.46  606/1615  4.46  4.31  4.24  4.18  4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   1   2  11  4.71  258/1566  4.71  4.16  4.07  4.04  4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   0   4   5   5  4.07  859/1528  4.07  4.35  4.12  4.07  4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   1   2   4   7  4.21  950/1650  4.21  4.06  4.22  4.12  4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   6   7   1  3.64 1644/1667  3.64  4.50  4.67  4.67  3.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0   0   2   3   3  4.13  877/1626  4.13  4.14  4.11  4.06  4.13


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   0   4   6   3  3.92 1337/1559  3.92  4.32  4.46  4.40  3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   2   2   9  4.54 1222/1560  4.54  4.73  4.72  4.67  4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   0   5   3   5  4.00 1146/1549  4.00  4.33  4.31  4.25  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0   1   2   6   4  4.00 1139/1546  4.00  4.26  4.32  4.24  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 7 1   1   1   1   2  3.33 1099/1323  3.33  3.76  4.00  3.99  3.33


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0   0   0   3   3   5  4.18  721/1384  4.18  4.28  4.10  4.12  4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0   0   0   0   6   5  4.45  660/1378  4.45  4.47  4.29  4.30  4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  0   0   0   6   5  4.45  702/1378  4.45  4.54  4.31  4.33  4.45
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   6   2   0   1   1   1  2.80  852/ 904  2.80  4.01  4.03  4.03  2.80

                                 Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1       0.00-0.99    1      A   1        Required for Majors  1    Graduate    0      Major       10
  28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0      B  11                                  Under-grad  14     Non-major    4
  56-83      2       2.00-2.99    3      C   2        General              2
  84-150     5       3.00-3.49    2      D   0
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    3      F   0        Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I   0        Other               10
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 305  0101              University of Maryland                          Page  743
Title        BRIT LIT:RESTOR - ROMA          Baltimore County                             AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   SMITH, ORIANNE                   Spring 2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   33
Questionnaires: 26             Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                  Questions            NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   1   3   2  20  4.58  589/1670  4.58  4.16  4.31  4.24  4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   1   3   3  19  4.54  582/1666  4.54  4.21  4.27  4.18  4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   1   1   1   3  20  4.54  566/1406  4.54  4.42  4.32  4.22  4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   1   0   3   2  20  4.54  520/1615  4.54  4.31  4.24  4.18  4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   2   5  19  4.65  302/1566  4.65  4.16  4.07  4.04  4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1   1   1   1   3  18  4.50  421/1528  4.50  4.35  4.12  4.07  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   0   3   3  20  4.65  372/1650  4.65  4.06  4.22  4.12  4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   8  18  4.69  992/1667  4.69  4.50  4.67  4.67  4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0   0   0   0  11  11  4.50  403/1626  4.50  4.14  4.11  4.06  4.50


                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0   0   1   0   2  21  4.79  452/1559  4.79  4.32  4.46  4.40  4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0   0   0   0   0  24  5.00    1/1560  5.00  4.73  4.72  4.67  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0   0   1   0   2  21  4.79  308/1549  4.79  4.33  4.31  4.25  4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0   1   0   0   5  18  4.63  570/1546  4.63  4.26  4.32  4.24  4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 18   0   0   0   1   4  4.80  ****/1323  ****  3.76  4.00  3.99  ****


                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5   0   0   1   1   3  16  4.62  364/1384  4.62  4.28  4.10  4.12  4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5   0   1   0   2   4  14  4.43  695/1378  4.43  4.47  4.29  4.30  4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0   0   0   0   1  20  4.95  141/1378  4.95  4.54  4.31  4.33  4.95
4. Were special techniques successful                   5   2   1   0   6   5   7  3.89  573/ 904  3.89  4.01  4.03  4.03  3.89


                  Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 25 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 239  ****  ****  4.21  3.99  ****


                  Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 25  0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  79  ****  4.38  4.64  4.53  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 25   0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  75  ****  4.50  4.57  4.50  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     25   0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  79  ****  4.00  4.45  3.68  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 25   0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  80  ****  4.33  3.97  3.76  ****


                  Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  25   0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50  4.44  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  25   0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  38  ****  ****  4.19  3.96  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        25   0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  38  ****  ****  4.62  4.68  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    25   0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  39  ****  ****  4.27  4.38  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  25   0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  31  ****  ****  4.47  4.51  ****


                  Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 25   0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64  3.33  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     25   0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67  4.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       25   0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54  2.63  ****


                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type               Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1       0.00-0.99   0      A   10       Required for Majors  0     Graduate     0        Major      19
  28-55      4       1.00-1.99   1      B    9
  56-83      4       2.00-2.99   1      C    3       General             3     Under-grad   26        Non-major   7
  84-150     5       3.00-3.49   3      D    0
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   6      F    0       Electives           0     #### - Means there are not enough
```

```
P    0                                              responses to be significant
I    0            Other            21
?    0
```

```
                                                 Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  1  1  6  10  4.39  835/1670  4.39 4.16  4.31 4.24  4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  6  5   6  3.89 1331/1666  3.89 4.21  4.27 4.18  3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  1  4  2  5   6  3.61 1247/1406  3.61 4.42  4.32 4.22  3.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   1  0  1  3  2  10  4.31  800/1615  4.31 4.31  4.24 4.18  4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  4  14  4.78  210/1566  4.78 4.16  4.07 4.04  4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  1  6  11  4.56  383/1528  4.56 4.35  4.12 4.07  4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  3  3  3   9  4.00 1135/1650  4.00 4.06  4.22 4.12  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0 17   1  4.06 1498/1667  4.06 4.50  4.67 4.67  4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  7  6   4  3.82 1200/1626  3.82 4.14  4.11 4.06  3.82


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        7   0  0  0  2  3   6  4.36 1062/1559  4.36 4.32  4.46 4.40  4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   7   0  0  0  2  1   8  4.55 1214/1560  4.55 4.73  4.72 4.67  4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7  0  0  1  1  4   5  4.18 1036/1549  4.18 4.33  4.31 4.25  4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     8   0  0  0  0  2   8  4.80  345/1546  4.80 4.26  4.32 4.24  4.80


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  1  2  13  4.75  257/1384  4.75 4.28  4.10 4.12  4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  1  0  5  10  4.50  603/1378  4.50 4.47  4.29 4.30  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0  1  0  4  11  4.56  615/1378  4.56 4.54  4.31 4.33  4.56
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type               Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      2        0.00-0.99   0       A    7         Required for Majors   1     Graduate      0     Major       14
28-55      0        1.00-1.99   1       B   10                                     Under-grad   18     Non-major    4
56-83      2        2.00-2.99   4       C    1         General               1
84-150     6        3.00-3.49   1       D    0
Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   5       F    0         Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                        I    0         Other                15
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 307  0101                University of Maryland                              Page  745
Title          AM LIT TO CIVIL WAR                  Baltimore County                            AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    STEWART, CAROLE                      Spring 2008                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    31
Questionnaires: 23                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean     Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  1  3  8  10  4.09 1172/1670  4.09  4.16  4.31 4.24  4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  2  3  6  12  4.22 1015/1666  4.22  4.21  4.27 4.18  4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  3  5  15  4.52  576/1406  4.52  4.42  4.32 4.22  4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  8  15  4.65  390/1615  4.65  4.31  4.24 4.18  4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  3  20  4.87  154/1566  4.87  4.16  4.07 4.04  4.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 10 12  4.48  462/1528  4.48  4.35  4.12 4.07  4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  2  6  15  4.57  485/1650  4.57  4.06  4.22 4.12  4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  1  22  4.96  338/1667  4.96  4.50  4.67 4.67  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 2 5 10  4  3.76 1247/1626  3.76  4.14  4.11 4.06  3.76

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  1  1  4  16  4.59  784/1559  4.59  4.32  4.46 4.40  4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  0  22  5.00    1/1560  5.00  4.73  4.72 4.67  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  3  0  5  14  4.36  864/1549  4.36  4.33  4.31 4.25  4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  1  2  4  15  4.50  715/1546  4.50  4.26  4.32 4.24  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 10 2 0 3  4   2  3.36 1092/1323  3.36  3.76  4.00 3.99  3.36

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  3  4  15  4.55  409/1384  4.55  4.28  4.10 4.12  4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  2  4  16  4.64  503/1378  4.64  4.47  4.29 4.30  4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 2 0  20  4.82  375/1378  4.82  4.54  4.31 4.33  4.82
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   2  3  0  6  6   5  3.50  718/ 904  3.50  4.01  4.03 4.03  3.50
```

                                  Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                   Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     0       0.00-0.99   0      A  12      Required for Majors  3    Graduate    0      Major      14
28-55     2       1.00-1.99   1      B   7                               Under-grad  23      Non-major   9
56-83     3       2.00-2.99   4      C   2      General              3
84-150    4       3.00-3.49   2      D   1
Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   6      F   0      Electives            3    #### - Means there are not enough
                                     P   0                               responses to be significant
                                     I   0      Other               16
                                     ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 308  0101              University of Maryland                            Page  746
Title       AM LIT AFTER CIVIL WAR              Baltimore County                            AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  GWIAZDA, PIOTR                       Spring 2008                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    32
Questionnaires:  27                Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  0  2  9  15  4.37  849/1670  4.37  4.16  4.31  4.24  4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  6  5  15  4.26  967/1666  4.26  4.21  4.27  4.18  4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  21  0  1  0  2   3  4.17 ****/1406  ****  4.42  4.32  4.22  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  1  0  1  8  16  4.46  606/1615  4.46  4.31  4.24  4.18  4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  1  2  23  4.74  234/1566  4.74  4.16  4.07  4.04  4.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  4  6  17  4.48  448/1528  4.48  4.35  4.12  4.07  4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  1  2  4  20  4.59  443/1650  4.59  4.06  4.22  4.12  4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  4  22  4.85  786/1667  4.85  4.50  4.67  4.67  4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1  0  1 11  10  4.26  716/1626  4.26  4.14  4.11  4.06  4.26


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  1  1  3  2  18  4.40 1022/1559  4.40  4.32  4.46  4.40  4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0  0  1  0  1  22  4.83  777/1560  4.83  4.73  4.72  4.67  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0  2  0  0  8  13  4.30  936/1549  4.30  4.33  4.31  4.25  4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0  0  2  2  2  18  4.50  715/1546  4.50  4.26  4.32  4.24  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  2  0  4  3  2  15  4.17  612/1323  4.17  3.76  4.00  3.99  4.17


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  2  4  3  15  4.29  644/1384  4.29  4.28  4.10  4.12  4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  1  2  2  20  4.64  495/1378  4.64  4.47  4.29  4.30  4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0  0  3  3  19  4.64  550/1378  4.64  4.54  4.31  4.33  4.64
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   2  2  3  8  4   6  3.39  763/ 904  3.39  4.01  4.03  4.03  3.39


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                   Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      4        0.00-0.99    0      A   13      Required for Majors   0      Graduate     0      Major       17
 28-55      2        1.00-1.99    0      B    6                                                       
 56-83      6        2.00-2.99    4      C    3      General               3      Under-grad  27      Non-major   10
 84-150     2        3.00-3.49    4      D    1                                                       
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   10      F    0      Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other                20
                                         ?    2
```

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 10   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA   1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0  1  0  1  8  4.60  557/1670  4.60  4.16  4.31  4.24  4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0  0  0  4  6  4.60  490/1666  4.60  4.21  4.27  4.18  4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0  0  0  4  6  4.60  495/1406  4.60  4.42  4.32  4.22  4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0  0  0  4  6  4.60  446/1615  4.60  4.31  4.24  4.18  4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1566  5.00  4.16  4.07  4.04  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  1  2  7  4.60  346/1528  4.60  4.35  4.12  4.07  4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0  0  0  4  6  4.60  429/1650  4.60  4.06  4.22  4.12  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0  0  1  8  1  4.00 1524/1667  4.00  4.50  4.67  4.67  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0  0  1  8  4.89  126/1626  4.89  4.14  4.11  4.06  4.89


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0  0  0  5  5  4.50  896/1559  4.50  4.32  4.46  4.40  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1560  5.00  4.73  4.72  4.67  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0  0  1  2  7  4.60  562/1549  4.60  4.33  4.31  4.25  4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0  0  1  1  8  4.70  482/1546  4.70  4.26  4.32  4.24  4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 8 0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/1323  ****  3.76  4.00  3.99  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   0  0  0  5  5  4.50  434/1384  4.50  4.28  4.10  4.12  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0  0  1  2  7  4.60  525/1378  4.60  4.47  4.29  4.30  4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0  0  0  4  6  4.60  590/1378  4.60  4.54  4.31  4.33  4.60
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   2   1  0  3  3  1  3.38  768/ 904  3.38  4.01  4.03  4.03  3.38
```

                                    Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                  Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1       0.00-0.99    0       A    1        Required for Majors   2      Graduate     0       Major        8
 28-55      2       1.00-1.99    0       B    5                                                          
 56-83      0       2.00-2.99    2       C    1        General               3      Under-grad  10       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
                                        P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other                 4
                                        ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 320  0101              University of Maryland                          Page  748
Title         TOPICS IN CT                   Baltimore County                              AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   WEXLER, LAURA                     Spring 2008                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     18
Questionnaires: 15                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions             NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0  1  0  4 10  4.53  632/1670  4.53 4.16  4.31 4.24  4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0  1  0  8  6  4.27  955/1666  4.27 4.21  4.27 4.18  4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  14   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1406  **** 4.42  4.32 4.22  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0   0  0  1  7  7  4.40  687/1615  4.40 4.31  4.24 4.18  4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0  0  0  3 12  4.80  187/1566  4.80 4.16  4.07 4.04  4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  3 12  4.80  173/1528  4.80 4.35  4.12 4.07  4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   2  1  5  2  5  3.47 1477/1650  3.47 4.06  4.22 4.12  3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0  0  0  0 15  5.00    1/1667  5.00 4.50  4.67 4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  0  2  3 10  4.53  379/1626  4.53 4.14  4.11 4.06  4.53


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2   0   0  0  1  3  9  4.62  755/1559  4.62 4.32  4.46 4.40  4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2   0   0  0  0  1 12  4.92  477/1560  4.92 4.73  4.72 4.67  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0   0  0  0  2 11  4.85  257/1549  4.85 4.33  4.31 4.25  4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2   0   0  0  1  3  9  4.62  582/1546  4.62 4.26  4.32 4.24  4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 11 0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/1323  **** 3.76  4.00 3.99  ****


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0   0  0  1  0 11  4.83  205/1384  4.83 4.28  4.10 4.12  4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0   0  0  0  1 11  4.92  218/1378  4.92 4.47  4.29 4.30  4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  0  0  0  3  9  4.75  439/1378  4.75 4.54  4.31 4.33  4.75
4. Were special techniques successful                 3   3   0  0  1  4  4  4.33  328/ 904  4.33 4.01  4.03 4.03  4.33


                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  41  **** ****  4.50 4.44  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14 0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  38  **** ****  4.19 3.96  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      14   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  38  **** ****  4.62 4.68  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  14   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  **** ****  4.27 4.38  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 324  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  749
Title       THEORIES OF COMM TECH            Baltimore County                               AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   BURGESS, HELEN                   Spring 2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   29
Questionnaires: 20              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions               NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean      Rank      Mean  Mean Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   1   1   8  10  4.35   876/1670   4.35  4.16  4.31  4.24  4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   2   9   9  4.35   846/1666   4.35  4.21  4.27  4.18  4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   7  13  4.65   435/1406   4.65  4.42  4.32  4.22  4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   2   6  12  4.50   552/1615   4.50  4.31  4.24  4.18  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   1   1  10   7  4.21   686/1566   4.21  4.16  4.07  4.04  4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0   0   0   5  14  4.74   240/1528   4.74  4.35  4.12  4.07  4.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   1   0   3   6   9  4.16  1020/1650   4.16  4.06  4.22  4.12  4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   3  16   0  3.84  1618/1667   3.84  4.50  4.67  4.67  3.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0   0   2   9   8  4.32   659/1626   4.32  4.14  4.11  4.06  4.32


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0   0   0   5  13  4.72   572/1559   4.72  4.32  4.46  4.40  4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   0   0   5  13  4.72  1004/1560   4.72  4.73  4.72  4.67  4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   0   0   1   8   9  4.44   762/1549   4.44  4.33  4.31  4.25  4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   1   1   3   6   7  3.94  1194/1546   3.94  4.26  4.32  4.24  3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 11  3   0   1   1   1  2.50  1269/1323   2.50  3.76  4.00  3.99  2.50


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0   0   1   1   3  10  4.47   476/1384   4.47  4.28  4.10  4.12  4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0   0   0   2   2  11  4.60   525/1378   4.60  4.47  4.29  4.30  4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0  0   0   0   1  14  4.93   197/1378   4.93  4.54  4.31  4.33  4.93
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   9   0   0   1   0   5  4.67   179/ 904   4.67  4.01  4.03  4.03  4.67

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                    Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0        A   8      Required for Majors   0      Graduate      0      Major        13
28-55      3      1.00-1.99    0        B  11                                  Under-grad   20      Non-major     7
56-83      3      2.00-2.99    3        C   1      General               0
84-150     2      3.00-3.49    4        D   0
Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    5        F   0      Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I   0      Other                18
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 326  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  750
Title       STRUCTURE OF ENGLISH            Baltimore County                             AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  FITZPATRICK, CA                  Spring 2008                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   28
Questionnaires:  15              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                         Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank     Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   0   6   3   6  4.00 1216/1670  4.00 4.16  4.31 4.24  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   2   6   2   5  3.67 1452/1666  3.67 4.21  4.27 4.18  3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   2   3   4   6  3.93 1108/1406  3.93 4.42  4.32 4.22  3.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   3   1   3   3   3   2  3.17 1550/1615  3.17 4.31  4.24 4.18  3.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   5   0   4   2   4  3.00 1478/1566  3.00 4.16  4.07 4.04  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0   3   5   2   2   3  2.80 1489/1528  2.80 4.35  4.12 4.07  2.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   2   3   3   7  4.00 1135/1650  4.00 4.06  4.22 4.12  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   1  14  4.93  472/1667  4.93 4.50  4.67 4.67  4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0   2   0   3   7   0  3.25 1491/1626  3.25 4.14  4.11 4.06  3.25


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0   1   1   4   2   5  3.69 1423/1559  3.69 4.32  4.46 4.40  3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0   0   0   2   3   8  4.46 1279/1560  4.46 4.73  4.72 4.67  4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0   2   1   3   3   4  3.46 1405/1549  3.46 4.33  4.31 4.25  3.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0   1   1   3   2   6  3.85 1256/1546  3.85 4.26  4.32 4.24  3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 10   1   1   0   0   1  2.67 ****/1323  **** 3.76  4.00 3.99  ****


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3   0   2   2   3   2   3  3.17 1231/1384  3.17 4.28  4.10 4.12  3.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3   0   2   2   2   2   4  3.33 1247/1378  3.33 4.47  4.29 4.30  3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0   3   3   4   0   2  2.58 1347/1378  2.58 4.54  4.31 4.33  2.58
4. Were special techniques successful                   3  10   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/ 904  **** 4.01  4.03 4.03  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 331  0101                University of Maryland                              Page  751
Title          CONTEMPORARY BRITISH L            Baltimore County                               AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    FERNANDEZ, JEAN                     Spring 2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      15
Questionnaires:  11                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                     Frequencies         Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                    NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   1   1   2   3   4  3.73 1458/1670  3.73  4.16  4.31  4.24  3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   6   2   2  3.45 1525/1666  3.45  4.21  4.27  4.18  3.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   6   0   1   1   2   1  3.60 1250/1406  3.60  4.42  4.32  4.22  3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   2   3   2   3  3.60 1418/1615  3.60  4.31  4.24  4.18  3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   1   1   4   5  4.18  715/1566  4.18  4.16  4.07  4.04  4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1   0   3   2   3   2  3.40 1328/1528  3.40  4.35  4.12  4.07  3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   2   2   1   4   2  3.18 1556/1650  3.18  4.06  4.22  4.12  3.18
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0  11   0  4.00 1524/1667  4.00  4.50  4.67  4.67  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0   2   2   3   4  3.82 1210/1626  3.82  4.14  4.11  4.06  3.82


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   0   3   4   3  4.00 1280/1559  4.00  4.32  4.46  4.40  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   2   1   7  4.50 1248/1560  4.50  4.73  4.72  4.67  4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   1   2   3   4  4.00 1146/1549  4.00  4.33  4.31  4.25  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0   2   0   3   5  4.10 1103/1546  4.10  4.26  4.32  4.24  4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 8  1   0   1   0   0  2.00 ****/1323  ****  3.76  4.00  3.99  ****


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   1   2   3   4  4.00  820/1384  4.00  4.28  4.10  4.12  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0   0   1   1   3   5  4.20  894/1378  4.20  4.47  4.29  4.30  4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0  0   0   2   3   5  4.30  840/1378  4.30  4.54  4.31  4.33  4.30
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   3   2   0   0   3   2  3.43  752/ 904  3.43  4.01  4.03  4.03  3.43
```

```
                                        Frequency Distribution

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

```
                                                     Frequencies            Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                       NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5   Mean    Rank     Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   1   0   1   5  15   4.50   665/1670   4.50  4.16  4.31  4.24  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   1   3   8  10   4.23  1003/1666   4.23  4.21  4.27  4.18  4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   0   0   0   6  16   4.73   352/1406   4.73  4.42  4.32  4.22  4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0   1   1   0   6  14   4.41   687/1615   4.41  4.31  4.24  4.18  4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  0  1  0  0  0  21   4.82   181/1566   4.82  4.16  4.07  4.04  4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  0  0  1  2  8  11   4.32   651/1528   4.32  4.35  4.12  4.07  4.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0   0   2   6  14   4.55   513/1650   4.55  4.06  4.22  4.12  4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0   0   0   7  15   4.68  1002/1667   4.68  4.50  4.67  4.67  4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  2  0  1  1  1  8   9   4.15   843/1626   4.15  4.14  4.11  4.06  4.15


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2   0   0   0   1   5  14   4.65   689/1559   4.65  4.32  4.46  4.40  4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2   0   0   0   0   0  20   5.00     1/1560   5.00  4.73  4.72  4.67  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  2  0  0  1  0  7  12   4.50   683/1549   4.50  4.33  4.31  4.25  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2   0   1   0   1   4  14   4.50   715/1546   4.50  4.26  4.32  4.24  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  2  9  3  1  1  3   3   3.18  1149/1323   3.18  3.76  4.00  3.99  3.18


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1  0  2  0  1  6  12   4.24   683/1384   4.24  4.28  4.10  4.12  4.24
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  1  0  1  0  3  4  13   4.33   797/1378   4.33  4.47  4.29  4.30  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1  0  2  0  1  3  15   4.38   768/1378   4.38  4.54  4.31  4.33  4.38
4. Were special techniques successful                 2   1   2   1   4   6   6   3.68   662/ 904   3.68  4.01  4.03  4.03  3.68
```

                              Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades           Reasons                    Type                    Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0       A    7        Required for Majors   4     Graduate     0        Major       12
  28-55      1        1.00-1.99    0       B   10                                                        
  56-83      0        2.00-2.99    3       C    4        General              11     Under-grad  22        Non-major   10
  84-150     7        3.00-3.49    5       D    0                                                        
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    5       F    0        Electives             2     #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                           I    0        Other                 5
                                           ?    1
```

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 13   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  1  6  6  4.38   835/1670   4.38  4.16  4.31  4.24  4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  0  6  6  4.31   908/1666   4.31  4.21  4.27  4.18  4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  11  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/1406   ****  4.42  4.32  4.22  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  2  3  8  4.46   606/1615   4.46  4.31  4.24  4.18  4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  1 11  4.77   218/1566   4.77  4.16  4.07  4.04  4.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  4  8  4.54   398/1528   4.54  4.35  4.12  4.07  4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  4  9  4.69   327/1650   4.69  4.06  4.22  4.12  4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  1 12  4.92   540/1667   4.92  4.50  4.67  4.67  4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 3 4 4  4.09   905/1626   4.09  4.14  4.11  4.06  4.09


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  0  3  8  4.73   572/1559   4.73  4.32  4.46  4.40  4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91   596/1560   4.91  4.73  4.72  4.67  4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  0  5  6  4.55   634/1549   4.55  4.33  4.31  4.25  4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  0  0  0  5  6  4.55   667/1546   4.55  4.26  4.32  4.24  4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 4 2 1 0 4 0  2.86  1234/1323   2.86  3.76  4.00  3.99  2.86


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  0  4  7  4.64   348/1384   4.64  4.28  4.10  4.12  4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  1  0  1  3  6  4.18   898/1378   4.18  4.47  4.29  4.30  4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 1 2 8  4.64   560/1378   4.64  4.54  4.31  4.33  4.64
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   0  0  0  3  2  6  4.27   361/ 904   4.27  4.01  4.03  4.03  4.27
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 371  0101          University of Maryland                                    Page  754
Title        CREATIVE WRITING-FICTI          Baltimore County                                  AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  SHIVNAN, SALLY                    Spring 2008                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    13
Questionnaires: 11                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                   Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  2  3  6  4.36   862/1670   4.36  4.16  4.31  4.24  4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  4  6  4.45   703/1666   4.45  4.21  4.27  4.18  4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1  0  0  0  3  7  4.70   346/1615   4.70  4.31  4.24  4.18  4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  2  2  7  4.45   440/1566   4.45  4.16  4.07  4.04  4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91   121/1528   4.91  4.35  4.12  4.07  4.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  1  0  5  5  4.27   879/1650   4.27  4.06  4.22  4.12  4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  7  4  4.36  1287/1667   4.36  4.50  4.67  4.67  4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  0  5  4  4.44   499/1626   4.44  4.14  4.11  4.06  4.44


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70   623/1559   4.70  4.32  4.46  4.40  4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90   596/1560   4.90  4.73  4.72  4.67  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80   294/1549   4.80  4.33  4.31  4.25  4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80   345/1546   4.80  4.26  4.32  4.24  4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  2  0  0  2  4  2  4.00   692/1323   4.00  3.76  4.00  3.99  4.00

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78   242/1384   4.78  4.28  4.10  4.12  4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00     1/1378   5.00  4.47  4.29  4.30  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89   302/1378   4.89  4.54  4.31  4.33  4.89
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   3  1  0  1  1  3  3.83   594/ 904   3.83  4.01  4.03  4.03  3.83

                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 373  0101              University of Maryland                        Page  755
Title      CREATIVE WRITING-POETR            Baltimore County                            AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   FALLON, MICHAEL                  Spring 2008                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    13
Questionnaires:  10                Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                         Frequencies      Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank      Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  5  5  4.50   665/1670  4.50 4.16  4.31 4.24  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  4  6  4.60   490/1666  4.60 4.21  4.27 4.18  4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   3  0  0  1  2  4  4.43   691/1406  4.43 4.42  4.32 4.22  4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1  0  0  0  4  5  4.56   499/1615  4.56 4.31  4.24 4.18  4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80   187/1566  4.80 4.16  4.07 4.04  4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80   173/1528  4.80 4.35  4.12 4.07  4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  1  1  1  2  5  3.90  1278/1650  3.90 4.06  4.22 4.12  3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  5  4  4.44  1216/1667  4.44 4.50  4.67 4.67  4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88   131/1626  4.88 4.14  4.11 4.06  4.88

               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  1  3  6  4.50   896/1559  4.50 4.32  4.46 4.40  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90   596/1560  4.90 4.73  4.72 4.67  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63   537/1549  4.63 4.33  4.31 4.25  4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  0  0  3  6  4.67   520/1546  4.67 4.26  4.32 4.24  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  3  1  0  0  1  3  4.00   692/1323  4.00 3.76  4.00 3.99  4.00

               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00     1/1384  5.00 4.28  4.10 4.12  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00     1/1378  5.00 4.47  4.29 4.30  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86   333/1378  4.86 4.54  4.31 4.33  4.86
4. Were special techniques successful                   3   2  0  0  0  0  5  5.00     1/ 904  5.00 4.01  4.03 4.03  5.00

               Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0  1  0  0  1  0  2.50  ****/ 239  **** ****  4.21 3.99  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/ 230  **** ****  4.44 4.25  ****

               Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 9  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  79  **** 4.38  4.64 4.53  ****

               Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  9   0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00  ****/  41  **** ****  4.50 4.44  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  9   0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00  ****/  38  **** ****  4.19 3.96  ****

               Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  28  **** ****  4.64 3.33  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     9   0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00  ****/  16  **** ****  4.67 4.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      9   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/   6  **** ****  4.92 ****  ****
```

```
                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 379  0101           University of Maryland                              Page  756
Title        PRINS/PRACT IN TECH CO        Baltimore County                                 AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   MAHER, JENNIFER               Spring 2008                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   22
Questionnaires: 14                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
         ------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0  1  0  1  5  6  4.15 1105/1670  4.15  4.16  4.31  4.24  4.15
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  2  1  4  2  4  3.38 1549/1666  3.38  4.21  4.27  4.18  3.38
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  11  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/1406  ****  4.42  4.32  4.22  ****
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  2  0  2  2  7  3.92 1203/1615  3.92  4.31  4.24  4.18  3.92
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  2  0  1  3  8  4.07  808/1566  4.07  4.16  4.07  4.04  4.07
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 1 3 9  4.36  611/1528  4.36  4.35  4.12  4.07  4.36
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   1  1  2  3  2  5  3.62 1425/1650  3.62  4.06  4.22  4.12  3.62
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   1  0  0  0  7  5  4.42 1246/1667  4.42  4.50  4.67  4.67  4.42
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 1 1 1 6 4  3.85 1181/1626  3.85  4.14  4.11  4.06  3.85


                Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0  2  1  1  4  3  3.45 1471/1559  3.45  4.32  4.46  4.40  3.45
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0  0  0  2  1  8  4.55 1214/1560  4.55  4.73  4.72  4.67  4.55
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  1  1  4  1  4  3.55 1379/1549  3.55  4.33  4.31  4.25  3.55
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0  1  0  3  3  4  3.82 1268/1546  3.82  4.26  4.32  4.24  3.82
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  6  1  0  1  0  3  3.80  894/1323  3.80  3.76  4.00  3.99  3.80


                Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  2  1  2  0  7  3.75  996/1384  3.75  4.28  4.10  4.12  3.75
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  1  4  1  6  4.00  970/1378  4.00  4.47  4.29  4.30  4.00
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 1 3 8  4.58  602/1378  4.58  4.54  4.31  4.33  4.58
 4. Were special techniques successful                  2   4  0  2  1  2  3  3.75  629/ 904  3.75  4.01  4.03  4.03  3.75


                Laboratory
 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  12  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 232  ****  ****  4.19  4.04  ****
 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/ 239  ****  ****  4.21  3.99  ****
 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/ 230  ****  ****  4.44  4.25  ****
 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           13  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 231  ****  ****  4.31  4.11  ****
 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 218  ****  ****  4.18  3.93  ****


                Seminar
 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  87  ****  4.83  4.65  4.30  ****
 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  4.38  4.64  4.53  ****
 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  75  ****  4.50  4.57  4.50  ****
 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    13  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  79  ****  4.00  4.45  3.68  ****
 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                13  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  80  ****  4.33  3.97  3.76  ****


                Field Work
 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50  4.44  ****
 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.19  3.96  ****
 3. Was the instructor available for consultation       13  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.62  4.68  ****
 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   13  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.27  4.38  ****
 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.47  4.51  ****


                Self  Paced
 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64  3.33  ****
 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    13  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67  4.00  ****
 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      13  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54  2.63  ****
 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       13  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84  ****  ****
 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     13  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/   6  ****  ****  4.92  ****  ****
```

                                       Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   1   0.00-0.99   0   A   3   Required for Majors   0   Graduate   0   Major   5
28-55   0   1.00-1.99   0   B   5
56-83   1   2.00-2.99   2   C   3   General   3   Under-grad   14   Non-major   9
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
                                        P   0   responses to be significant
                                        I   0   Other   9
                                        ?   1

Questionnaires: 17   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                                 Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                  Questions                 NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   1  11   5  4.24 1017/1670  4.24  4.16  4.31  4.24  4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1  10   6  4.29  919/1666  4.29  4.21  4.27  4.18  4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   9   0   0   0   4   4  4.50  597/1406  4.50  4.42  4.32  4.22  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2   0   0   0  10   5  4.33  775/1615  4.33  4.31  4.24  4.18  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   3   2   2   8   2  3.24 1415/1566  3.24  4.16  4.07  4.04  3.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   2   6   9  4.41  546/1528  4.41  4.35  4.12  4.07  4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   1   2   2   5   4   3  3.25 1541/1650  3.25  4.06  4.22  4.12  3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0  17  5.00    1/1667  5.00  4.50  4.67  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3   0   0   0   5   9   0  3.64 1323/1626  3.64  4.14  4.11  4.06  3.64


                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0   0   1   7   7  4.40 1022/1559  4.40  4.32  4.46  4.40  4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   0   0   3  12  4.80  855/1560  4.80  4.73  4.72  4.67  4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0   0   0   0   8   7  4.47  736/1549  4.47  4.33  4.31  4.25  4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   0   1   1   8   5  4.13 1079/1546  4.13  4.26  4.32  4.24  4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4   3   0   2   5   0   3  3.40 1082/1323  3.40  3.76  4.00  3.99  3.40


                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0   1   2   3   4   1  3.18 1223/1384  3.18  4.28  4.10  4.12  3.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0   1   1   3   3   3  3.55 1178/1378  3.55  4.47  4.29  4.30  3.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6   0   0   1   1   3   6  4.27  856/1378  4.27  4.54  4.31  4.33  4.27
4. Were special techniques successful                  6   9   1   0   0   1   0  2.50 ****/ 904  ****  4.01  4.03  4.03  ****
```

                                  Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27       0          0.00-0.99    0      A    2        Required for Majors   0     Graduate      0       Major        13
28-55       1          1.00-1.99    0      B    9                                                          
56-83       2          2.00-2.99    1      C    2        General               2     Under-grad   17       Non-major     4
84-150      4          3.00-3.49    5      D    0
Grad.       0          3.50-4.00    2      F    0        Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                           I    0        Other                11
                                           ?    1
```

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 16   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                                 Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  2  5  9  4.44  765/1670  4.44  4.16  4.31  4.24  4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  3  4  9  4.38  821/1666  4.38  4.21  4.27  4.18  4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  15  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1406  ****  4.42  4.32  4.22  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   2  0  0  3  2  9  4.43  660/1615  4.43  4.31  4.24  4.18  4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   2  3  2  4  2  3  3.00 1478/1566  3.00  4.16  4.07  4.04  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0   1  0  0  0  2 13  4.87  141/1528  4.87  4.35  4.12  4.07  4.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   2  0  2  6  4  2  3.43 1494/1650  3.43  4.06  4.22  4.12  3.43
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0  0  0  0  4 11  4.73  946/1667  4.73  4.50  4.67  4.67  4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  2   0  0  0  2  6  6  4.29  693/1626  4.29  4.14  4.11  4.06  4.29


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  0  3  7  5  4.13 1237/1559  4.13  4.32  4.46  4.40  4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  0  0  0 15  5.00    1/1560  5.00  4.73  4.72  4.67  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  1   0  0  0  3  6  6  4.20 1027/1549  4.20  4.33  4.31  4.25  4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  0  1  3  4  7  4.13 1079/1546  4.13  4.26  4.32  4.24  4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  1  12  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/1323  ****  3.76  4.00  3.99  ****


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  3   0  0  0  3  2  8  4.38  560/1384  4.38  4.28  4.10  4.12  4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  3   0  0  0  1  0 12  4.85  306/1378  4.85  4.47  4.29  4.30  4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  3   0  0  0  0  1 12  4.92  225/1378  4.92  4.54  4.31  4.33  4.92
4. Were special techniques successful                 3   9  0  0  2  0  2  4.00  461/ 904  4.00  4.01  4.03  4.03  4.00
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                  Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0      A   9        Required for Majors   1    Graduate      0      Major         8
28-55      1        1.00-1.99    0      B   4                                                        
56-83      4        2.00-2.99    2      C   0        General               5    Under-grad   16      Non-major     8
84-150     5        3.00-3.49    2      D   0                                                        
Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    9      F   0        Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                   responses to be significant
                                        I   0        Other                 9
                                        ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 386  0101            University of Maryland                          Page  759
Title       ADULT LITERACY TUTORIN            Baltimore County                          AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   MCCARTHY, LUCIL                   Spring 2008                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      9
Questionnaires:  7              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  1  0  6  4.71  414/1670  4.71  4.16  4.31  4.24  4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  622/1666  4.50  4.21  4.27  4.18  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   4  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1406  5.00  4.42  4.32  4.22  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  552/1615  4.50  4.31  4.24  4.18  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1566  5.00  4.16  4.07  4.04  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  1  1  5  4.57  368/1528  4.57  4.35  4.12  4.07  4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  307/1650  4.71  4.06  4.22  4.12  4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  768/1667  4.86  4.50  4.67  4.67  4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  1  2  2  4.20  797/1626  4.20  4.14  4.11  4.06  4.20


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3   0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1559  5.00  4.32  4.46  4.40  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3   0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1560  5.00  4.73  4.72  4.67  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  366/1549  4.75  4.33  4.31  4.25  4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      4   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  520/1546  4.67  4.26  4.32  4.24  4.67


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1384  5.00  4.28  4.10  4.12  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1378  5.00  4.47  4.29  4.30  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1378  5.00  4.54  4.31  4.33  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   1  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  146/ 904  4.75  4.01  4.03  4.03  4.75


                                    Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 387  0101                University of Maryland                           Page  760
Title        WEB DESIGN & AUTHORING              Baltimore County                             AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  BURGESS, HELEN                        Spring 2008                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     19
Questionnaires: 19                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0  0  1  6  12  4.58  589/1670  4.58 4.16  4.31 4.24  4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0  0  3  3  13  4.53  595/1666  4.53 4.21  4.27 4.18  4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  14   0  0  0  0   5  5.00    1/1406  5.00 4.42  4.32 4.22  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2   0  0  2  6   9  4.41  673/1615  4.41 4.31  4.24 4.18  4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1   3  4  2  4   5  3.22 1419/1566  3.22 4.16  4.07 4.04  3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  1  0  7  6   4  3.67 1202/1528  3.67 4.35  4.12 4.07  3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   1   1  0  4  4  10  4.33  806/1650  4.33 4.06  4.22 4.12  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0  0  0 11   8  4.42 1236/1667  4.42 4.50  4.67 4.67  4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0  0  0  2  8   4  4.14  854/1626  4.14 4.14  4.11 4.06  4.14


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        7   0   0  0  1  3   8  4.58  796/1559  4.58 4.32  4.46 4.40  4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   7   0   0  0  0  0  12  5.00    1/1560  5.00 4.73  4.72 4.67  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7  0   0  0  2  2   8  4.50  683/1549  4.50 4.33  4.31 4.25  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     7   0   0  0  2  3   7  4.42  835/1546  4.42 4.26  4.32 4.24  4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 0   0  0  2  2   8  4.50  326/1323  4.50 3.76  4.00 3.99  4.50


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0   0  1  2  1   3  3.86  953/1384  3.86 4.28  4.10 4.12  3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0   0  0  2  1   4  4.29  842/1378  4.29 4.47  4.29 4.30  4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0  0  0  2  1   4  4.29  850/1378  4.29 4.54  4.31 4.33  4.29
4. Were special techniques successful                  12   3   0  0  0  0   4  5.00 ****/ 904  **** 4.01  4.03 4.03  ****


               Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  18   0   0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 232  **** ****  4.19 4.04  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 239  **** ****  4.21 3.99  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 18 0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 230  **** ****  4.44 4.25  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           18   0   0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 231  **** ****  4.31 4.11  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18   0   0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 218  **** ****  4.18 3.93  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0      A   10      Required for Majors  2    Graduate    0     Major       10
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0      B    7
  56-83      2      2.00-2.99    3      C    0      General              6    Under-grad  19    Non-major    9
  84-150     7      3.00-3.49    3      D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    7      F    0      Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                               responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                8
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 391  0101              University of Maryland                         Page  761
Title          ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT            Baltimore County                            AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    BURNS, MARGIE                    Spring 2008                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    16
Questionnaires: 8                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  1  0  0  3  4  4.13 1139/1670  4.12 4.16  4.31 4.24  4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  1  0  1  4  2  3.75 1409/1666  3.93 4.21  4.27 4.18  3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  1  0  2  1  4  3.88 1147/1406  4.34 4.42  4.32 4.22  3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   0  0  1  0  3  3  4.14  990/1615  4.29 4.31  4.24 4.18  4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1  1  0  0  3  3  4.00  851/1566  3.77 4.16  4.07 4.04  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  1  0  0  2  5  4.25  706/1528  4.45 4.35  4.12 4.07  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   1  0  0  4  0  3  3.86 1304/1650  4.11 4.06  4.22 4.12  3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63 1062/1667  4.76 4.50  4.67 4.67  4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  1  4  2  4.14  854/1626  4.12 4.14  4.11 4.06  4.14


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  1  1  6  4.63  739/1559  4.52 4.32  4.46 4.40  4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  948/1560  4.72 4.73  4.72 4.67  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  1  0  0  2  4  4.14 1070/1549  4.14 4.33  4.31 4.25  4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  2  0  0  3  3  3.63 1345/1546  4.02 4.26  4.32 4.24  3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  5  0  0  1  0  1  4.00  692/1323  4.00 3.76  4.00 3.99  4.00


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1   0  1  0  2  1  3  3.71 1013/1384  4.12 4.28  4.10 4.12  3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1   0  0  0  2  1  4  4.29  842/1378  4.60 4.47  4.29 4.30  4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  1  2  4  4.43  731/1378  4.63 4.54  4.31 4.33  4.43
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   4  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  243/ 904  4.26 4.01  4.03 4.03  4.50

                                  Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                 Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0      A   2      Required for Majors  0     Graduate    0      Major       4
28-55      3        1.00-1.99    0      B   5
56-83      0        2.00-2.99    3      C   0      General              1     Under-grad  8      Non-major   4
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
                                       P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I   0      Other                6
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 391  0201                University of Maryland                                    Page 762
Title        ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT              Baltimore County                                        AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  FITZPATRICK, CA                   Spring 2008                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   27
Questionnaires: 19              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                             Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  2  0  5 10  2  3.53 1531/1670  4.12  4.16  4.31  4.24  3.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  2  2  3  8  3  3.44 1529/1666  3.93  4.21  4.27  4.18  3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  18  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/1406  4.34  4.42  4.32  4.22  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  3  4  3  8  3.89 1246/1615  4.29  4.31  4.24  4.18  3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  6  1  4  3  4  2.89 1515/1566  3.77  4.16  4.07  4.04  2.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  3  1  5 10  4.16  796/1528  4.45  4.35  4.12  4.07  4.16
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  2  2  4  5  6  3.58 1439/1650  4.11  4.06  4.22  4.12  3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   1  0  0  0  5 12  4.71  983/1667  4.76  4.50  4.67  4.67  4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  1  0  2  5  7  1  3.47 1405/1626  4.12  4.14  4.11  4.06  3.47


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  1  4  6  6  4.00 1280/1559  4.52  4.32  4.46  4.40  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  1  7  9  4.47 1271/1560  4.72  4.73  4.72  4.67  4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  1  1  3  7  4  3.75 1308/1549  4.14  4.33  4.31  4.25  3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   1  1  2  5  2  6  3.63 1345/1546  4.02  4.26  4.32  4.24  3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 15  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1323  4.00  3.76  4.00  3.99  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  1  4  4  6  4.00  820/1384  4.12  4.28  4.10  4.12  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  0  0  0  6  9  4.60  525/1378  4.60  4.47  4.29  4.30  4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0  0  0  1  6  8  4.47  692/1378  4.63  4.54  4.31  4.33  4.47
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   8  0  1  2  2  1  3.50  718/ 904  4.26  4.01  4.03  4.03  3.50

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                   Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0      A    4      Required for Majors   0      Graduate     0       Major        11
 28-55      1      1.00-1.99    0      B   10
 56-83      5      2.00-2.99    3      C    5      General               0      Under-grad  19       Non-major     8
 84-150     5      3.00-3.49    3      D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    5      F    0      Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                19
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 391  0401             University of Maryland                              Page  763
Title      ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT              Baltimore County                              AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   SNEERINGER, HOL                   Spring 2008                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   19
Questionnaires:  17                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  0  1  3 13  4.71  427/1670  4.12  4.16  4.31  4.24  4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  7 10  4.59  516/1666  3.93  4.21  4.27  4.18  4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  7  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  261/1406  4.34  4.42  4.32  4.22  4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  3 14  4.82  231/1615  4.29  4.31  4.24  4.18  4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  3  4 10  4.41  480/1566  3.77  4.16  4.07  4.04  4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  1 16  4.94   73/1528  4.45  4.35  4.12  4.07  4.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  0  1  0 16  4.88  173/1650  4.11  4.06  4.22  4.12  4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  1 16  4.94  405/1667  4.76  4.50  4.67  4.67  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  0  0  0  4 12  4.75  207/1626  4.12  4.14  4.11  4.06  4.75


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2  0  0  0  0  1 14  4.93  193/1559  4.52  4.32  4.46  4.40  4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2  0  0  0  0  1 14  4.93  417/1560  4.72  4.73  4.72  4.67  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  1  0  1  1 12  4.53  646/1549  4.14  4.33  4.31  4.25  4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2  0  0  0  0  3 12  4.80  345/1546  4.02  4.26  4.32  4.24  4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 11  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/1323  4.00  3.76  4.00  3.99  ****


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  0  4  7  4.64  348/1384  4.12  4.28  4.10  4.12  4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91  243/1378  4.60  4.47  4.29  4.30  4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1378  4.63  4.54  4.31  4.33  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 6  2  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  138/ 904  4.26  4.01  4.03  4.03  4.78


                                       Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades           Reasons                  Type                   Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0       0.00-0.99   0       A   7       Required for Majors   2       Graduate     0       Major        8
28-55      0       1.00-1.99   0       B   8                                                          
56-83      1       2.00-2.99   4       C   0       General               0       Under-grad  17       Non-major    9
84-150     7       3.00-3.49   3       D   0                                                          
Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   3       F   0       Electives             0       #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0                                     responses to be significant
                                       I   0       Other                13
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 392  0101                University of Maryland                          Page 764
Title         TUTORIAL IN WRITING                Baltimore County                          AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   BENSON, LINDA K                      Spring 2008                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     3
Questionnaires:  3                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  1  2  0  3.67 1486/1670  4.29  4.16  4.31  4.24  3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 1199/1666  4.29  4.21  4.27  4.18  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33  775/1615  4.67  4.31  4.24  4.18  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1528  4.64  4.35  4.12  4.07  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  1  0  1  1  3.67 1404/1650  3.97  4.06  4.22  4.12  3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 1022/1667  4.80  4.50  4.67  4.67  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  0  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  278/1626  4.39  4.14  4.11  4.06  4.67


                                      Frequency Distribution

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

Enrollment: 4
Questionnaires: 1   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                                  Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                  Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1670  4.29  4.16  4.31  4.24  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1666  4.29  4.21  4.27  4.18  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1406  5.00  4.42  4.32  4.22  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1615  4.67  4.31  4.24  4.18  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1528  4.64  4.35  4.12  4.07  5.00
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 392  0301            University of Maryland                            Page  766
Title        TUTORIAL IN WRITING            Baltimore County                              AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  BENSON, LINDA K                 Spring 2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     4
Questionnaires:  3                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean      Rank     Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0  0  0  1  2  4.67   479/1670  4.29 4.16  4.31 4.24  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0  0  1  0  2  4.33   870/1666  4.29 4.21  4.27 4.18  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   2   0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/1406  5.00 4.42  4.32 4.22  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1615  4.67 4.31  4.24 4.18  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1528  4.64 4.35  4.12 4.07  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1650  3.97 4.06  4.22 4.12  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1667  4.80 4.50  4.67 4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50   403/1626  4.39 4.14  4.11 4.06  4.50


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1559  4.67 4.32  4.46 4.40  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1560  4.83 4.73  4.72 4.67  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1549  4.83 4.33  4.31 4.25  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1546  4.83 4.26  4.32 4.24  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/1323  5.00 3.76  4.00 3.99  5.00


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0   0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1384  4.92 4.28  4.10 4.12  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0   0   0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1378  5.00 4.47  4.29 4.30  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1378  5.00 4.54  4.31 4.33  5.00


                                         Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 392  0401            University of Maryland                              Page  767
Title       TUTORIAL IN WRITING              Baltimore County                               AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  FALLON, MICHAEL                    Spring 2008                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     3
Questionnaires:  3                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33   902/1670  4.29  4.16  4.31  4.24  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33   870/1666  4.29  4.21  4.27  4.18  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/1406  5.00  4.42  4.32  4.22  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   379/1615  4.67  4.31  4.24  4.18  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/1566  5.00  4.16  4.07  4.04  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50   421/1528  4.64  4.35  4.12  4.07  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   361/1650  3.97  4.06  4.22  4.12  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  1022/1667  4.80  4.50  4.67  4.67  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33   637/1626  4.39  4.14  4.11  4.06  4.33


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/1559  4.67  4.32  4.46  4.40  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/1560  4.83  4.73  4.72  4.67  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/1549  4.83  4.33  4.31  4.25  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/1546  4.83  4.26  4.32  4.24  5.00

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   324/1384  4.92  4.28  4.10  4.12  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1378  5.00  4.47  4.29  4.30  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1378  5.00  4.54  4.31  4.33  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   0   1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50   243/ 904  4.75  4.01  4.03  4.03  4.50

                                    Frequency Distribution


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

```
Enrollment:    3
Questionnaires:  3                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                           Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   479/1670  4.29  4.16  4.31  4.24  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   415/1666  4.29  4.21  4.27  4.18  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   379/1615  4.67  4.31  4.24  4.18  4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1528  4.64  4.35  4.12  4.07  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   1  0  0  0  2  0  4.00  1135/1650  3.97  4.06  4.22  4.12  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  1022/1667  4.80  4.50  4.67  4.67  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  1   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50   403/1626  4.39  4.14  4.11  4.06  4.50

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/1384  4.92  4.28  4.10  4.12  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  2   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/1378  5.00  4.47  4.29  4.30  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  2   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/1378  5.00  4.54  4.31  4.33  5.00

                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  1   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/ 87  5.00  4.83  4.65  4.30  5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  1   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/ 79  4.50  4.38  4.64  4.53  5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  1   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/ 75  4.50  4.50  4.57  4.50  5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    1   0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00    62/ 79  3.50  4.00  4.45  3.68  4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                1   1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00    37/ 80  4.00  4.33  3.97  3.76  4.00
```

```
                                       Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 392  0601            University of Maryland                          Page  769
Title          TUTORIAL IN WRITING          Baltimore County                            AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    FALLON, MICHAEL                Spring 2008                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     3
Questionnaires:  3               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean      Rank       Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   479/1670   4.29 4.16  4.31 4.24  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   415/1666   4.29 4.21  4.27 4.18  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/1406   5.00 4.42  4.32 4.22  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1615   4.67 4.31  4.24 4.18  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  1  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1528   4.64 4.35  4.12 4.07  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50  1460/1650   3.97 4.06  4.22 4.12  3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1667   4.80 4.50  4.67 4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  0  0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33  637/1626   4.39 4.14  4.11 4.06  4.33


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00  1280/1559   4.67 4.32  4.46 4.40  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  1248/1560   4.83 4.73  4.72 4.67  4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50   683/1549   4.83 4.33  4.31 4.25  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50   715/1546   4.83 4.26  4.32 4.24  4.50


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1384   4.92 4.28  4.10 4.12  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1378   5.00 4.47  4.29 4.30  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1378   5.00 4.54  4.31 4.33  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   1   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/ 904   4.75 4.01  4.03 4.03  5.00

                                 Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 392  1201                University of Maryland                        Page  770
Title           TUTORIAL IN WRITING               Baltimore County                        AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:     FITZPATRICK, CA                    Spring 2008                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     5
Questionnaires:  1                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1620/1670  4.29  4.16  4.31  4.24  3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1603/1666  4.29  4.21  4.27  4.18  3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1083/1615  4.67  4.31  4.24  4.18  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1447/1528  4.64  4.35  4.12  4.07  3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1580/1650  3.97  4.06  4.22  4.12  3.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  0   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  953/1626  4.39  4.14  4.11  4.06  4.00

                 Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  0   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00   69/  79  4.50  4.38  4.64  4.53  4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   0   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00   58/  75  4.50  4.50  4.57  4.50  4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       0   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00   75/  79  3.50  4.00  4.45  3.68  3.00
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 393  0101           University of Maryland                       Page  771
Title       TECHNICAL WRITING                 Baltimore County                        AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  HICKERNELL, MAR                    Spring 2008                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     23
Questionnaires: 13               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                      Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions            NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  2  1  8  2  3.77 1436/1670  3.53  4.16  4.31  4.24  3.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  8  5  4.38  808/1666  3.90  4.21  4.27  4.18  4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  9  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  318/1406  4.33  4.42  4.32  4.22  4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  1  0  0  0  4  8  4.67  379/1615  4.03  4.31  4.24  4.18  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  2  4  4  3  3.62 1225/1566  3.66  4.16  4.07  4.04  3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  1  0  3  8  4.50  421/1528  4.01  4.35  4.12  4.07  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  1  0  0  1  5  5  4.36  769/1650  3.88  4.06  4.22  4.12  4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00    1/1667  4.51  4.50  4.67  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  0  1  2  7  2  3.83 1191/1626  3.61  4.14  4.11  4.06  3.83


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3  0  0  0  1  2  7  4.60  772/1559  3.91  4.32  4.46  4.40  4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3  0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  855/1560  4.37  4.73  4.72  4.67  4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  0  1  2  7  4.60  562/1549  3.99  4.33  4.31  4.25  4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3  0  0  1  2  1  6  4.20 1032/1546  3.65  4.26  4.32  4.24  4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  5  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  545/1323  3.73  3.76  4.00  3.99  4.25


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0  1  0  0  1  2  3.75  996/1384  3.69  4.28  4.10  4.12  3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0  1  0  0  2  1  3.50 1193/1378  4.08  4.47  4.29  4.30  3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9  0  1  0  0  3  0  3.25 1276/1378  3.91  4.54  4.31  4.33  3.25
4. Were special techniques successful                  9  1  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/ 904  3.40  4.01  4.03  4.03  ****

                                  Frequency Distribution

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

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 11   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                                Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                   Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                   General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   2  0  1  2  2  1  3 3.33 1583/1670 3.53  4.16  4.31 4.24  3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2  0  1  1  1  3  3 3.67 1452/1666 3.90  4.21  4.27 4.18  3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2  8  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/1406 4.33  4.42  4.32 4.22  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  0  1  0  3  2  4 3.80 1294/1615 4.03  4.31  4.24 4.18  3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 4  1  0  2  1  1 3.20 1428/1566 3.66  4.16  4.07 4.04  3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 2 1 3 4 3.90 1039/1528 4.01  4.35  4.12 4.07  3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  1  1  2  2  4 3.70 1388/1650 3.88  4.06  4.22 4.12  3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0  7  3 4.30 1334/1667 4.51  4.50  4.67 4.67  4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 3 1 1 4 3.67 1312/1626 3.61  4.14  4.11 4.06  3.67


                   Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  2  1  3  4 3.90 1352/1559 3.91  4.32  4.46 4.40  3.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  1  4  2  3 3.70 1508/1560 4.37  4.73  4.72 4.67  3.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  0  2  0  5  3 3.90 1237/1549 3.99  4.33  4.31 4.25  3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  2  0  2  4  2 3.40 1411/1546 3.65  4.26  4.32 4.24  3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 1 0 1 5 3 3.90  820/1323 3.73  3.76  4.00 3.99  3.90


                   Discussion
4. Were special techniques successful                 10  0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/ 904 3.40  4.01  4.03 4.03  ****
```

                                          Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 393  0301              University of Maryland                    Page  773
Title        TECHNICAL WRITING                Baltimore County                        AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  HARRIS, LINDA R                   Spring 2008                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    23
Questionnaires: 17                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  4  2  7  3  1  2.71 1648/1670  3.53  4.16  4.31  4.24  2.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  2  4  5  2  4  3.12 1595/1666  3.90  4.21  4.27  4.18  3.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  16  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1406  4.33  4.42  4.32  4.22  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1  0  3  4  3  6  3.75 1325/1615  4.03  4.31  4.24  4.18  3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  13  2  0  0  0  1  2.33 ****/1566  3.66  4.16  4.07  4.04  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1  2  0  5  3  5  3.60 1233/1528  4.01  4.35  4.12  4.07  3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  3  3  5  3  2  2.88 1604/1650  3.88  4.06  4.22  4.12  2.88
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  1  0  2  9  5  4.00 1524/1667  4.51  4.50  4.67  4.67  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  1  5  8  2  0  2.69 1585/1626  3.61  4.14  4.11  4.06  2.69


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  1  8  7  0  3.38 1485/1559  3.91  4.32  4.46  4.40  3.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  2  5  7  2  3.56 1521/1560  4.37  4.73  4.72  4.67  3.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  1  0  6  6  3  3.63 1358/1549  3.99  4.33  4.31  4.25  3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  3  4  4  3  2  2.81 1505/1546  3.65  4.26  4.32  4.24  2.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  0  0  3  3  6  4  3.69  950/1323  3.73  3.76  4.00  3.99  3.69


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13  0  2  0  2  0  0  2.00 ****/1384  3.69  4.28  4.10  4.12  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13  0  0  0  3  0  1  3.50 ****/1378  4.08  4.47  4.29  4.30  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0  0  1  2  0  1  3.25 ****/1378  3.91  4.54  4.31  4.33  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1      0.00-0.99   1      A   14      Required for Majors  1    Graduate     0      Major       0
 28-55     0      1.00-1.99   0      B    3
 56-83     0      2.00-2.99   1      C    0      General              0    Under-grad  17      Non-major  17
 84-150   10      3.00-3.49   3      D    0
 Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   8      F    0      Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                     P    0                               responses to be significant
                                     I    0      Other               13
                                     ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 393  0401              University of Maryland                           Page  774
Title      TECHNICAL WRITING                    Baltimore County                             AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   ROCKETT, DANIKA                     Spring 2008                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   26
Questionnaires: 19                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  2  0  4  13  4.47  708/1670  3.53  4.16  4.31  4.24  4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  0  0  0  4  14  4.78  291/1666  3.90  4.21  4.27  4.18  4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   9  0  0  0  4   6  4.60  495/1406  4.33  4.42  4.32  4.22  4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  1  17  4.84  217/1615  4.03  4.31  4.24  4.18  4.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  2  0  2  5   9  4.06  820/1566  3.66  4.16  4.07  4.04  4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  0  1  3  14  4.72  250/1528  4.01  4.35  4.12  4.07  4.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0  0  0  1  2  14  4.76  263/1650  3.88  4.06  4.22  4.12  4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0 10   8  4.44 1216/1667  4.51  4.50  4.67  4.67  4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  0  1  5  10  4.56  355/1626  3.61  4.14  4.11  4.06  4.56


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  4  15  4.79  469/1559  3.91  4.32  4.46  4.40  4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  0  19  5.00    1/1560  4.37  4.73  4.72  4.67  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  2  17  4.89  211/1549  3.99  4.33  4.31  4.25  4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  1  0  0  4  14  4.58  631/1546  3.65  4.26  4.32  4.24  4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  6  0  1  1  4   7  4.31  507/1323  3.73  3.76  4.00  3.99  4.31


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10  0  0  0  0  2   7  4.78  242/1384  3.69  4.28  4.10  4.12  4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10  0  0  0  1  0   8  4.78  379/1378  4.08  4.47  4.29  4.30  4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0  0  0  0  2   7  4.78  417/1378  3.91  4.54  4.31  4.33  4.78
4. Were special techniques successful                   10  3  0  0  3  1   2  3.83  594/ 904  3.40  4.01  4.03  4.03  3.83

                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                    Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0        0.00-0.99   0      A   10       Required for Majors   0      Graduate     0       Major         1
 28-55      0        1.00-1.99   0      B    7
 56-83      1        2.00-2.99   5      C    1       General               0      Under-grad  19       Non-major    18
 84-150     8        3.00-3.49   3      D    0
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   3      F    0       Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                17
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 393  0501           University of Maryland                          Page  775
Title       TECHNICAL WRITING             Baltimore County                            AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  SINGH, YASHODA               Spring 2008                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     24
Questionnaires: 21                Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies     Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank  Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0  2  3  2  8  5 3.55 1524/1670 3.53 4.16 4.31 4.24 3.55
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  2  0  5  5  9 3.90 1318/1666 3.90 4.21 4.27 4.18 3.90
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   9  2  0  1  4  5 3.83 1169/1406 4.33 4.42 4.32 4.22 3.83
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  3  1  2  8  7 3.71 1349/1615 4.03 4.31 4.24 4.18 3.71
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  3  3  1  4  9 3.65 1205/1566 3.66 4.16 4.07 4.04 3.65
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  2  0  1  6 12 4.24  724/1528 4.01 4.35 4.12 4.07 4.24
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   1  2  0  4  6  8 3.90 1278/1650 3.88 4.06 4.22 4.12 3.90
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  1  0  0  0 20 4.81  861/1667 4.51 4.50 4.67 4.67 4.81
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 3  0  2 10  3 3.56 1365/1626 3.61 4.14 4.11 4.06 3.56


            Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  2  0  5  4 10 3.95 1316/1559 3.91 4.32 4.46 4.40 3.95
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  2  0  2  2 15 4.33 1376/1560 4.37 4.73 4.72 4.67 4.33
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  2  2  2  7  8 3.81 1285/1549 3.99 4.33 4.31 4.25 3.81
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  5  0  2  6  8 3.57 1361/1546 3.65 4.26 4.32 4.24 3.57
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2  3  1  8  4  3 3.16 1158/1323 3.73 3.76 4.00 3.99 3.16


            Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16 0 2  0  0  2  1 3.00 ****/1384 3.69 4.28 4.10 4.12 ****
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16 0 2  0  0  1  2 3.20 ****/1378 4.08 4.47 4.29 4.30 ****
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 2 0  0  0  3 3.40 ****/1378 3.91 4.54 4.31 4.33 ****
 4. Were special techniques successful                 16   0  1  2  2  0  0 2.20 ****/ 904 3.40 4.01 4.03 4.03 ****


            Laboratory
 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 20   0  1  0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/ 232 **** **** 4.19 4.04 ****
 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 20 0 1 0 0  0  0 1.00 ****/ 239 **** **** 4.21 3.99 ****
 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 20 0 1 0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/ 230 **** **** 4.44 4.25 ****
 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          20   0  1  0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/ 231 **** **** 4.31 4.11 ****
 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 20  0  1  0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/ 218 **** **** 4.18 3.93 ****


            Seminar
 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 20 0 1 0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/  87 **** 4.83 4.65 4.30 ****
 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 20 0 1 0 0  0  0 1.00 ****/  79 **** 4.38 4.64 4.53 ****
 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 20 0 1 0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/  75 **** 4.50 4.57 4.50 ****
 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   20   0  1  0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/  79 **** 4.00 4.45 3.68 ****
 5. Were criteria for grading made clear               20   0  1  0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/  80 **** 4.33 3.97 3.76 ****


            Field Work
 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 20  0  1  0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/  41 **** **** 4.50 4.44 ****
 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 20  0  1  0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/  38 **** **** 4.19 3.96 ****
 3. Was the instructor available for consultation      20   0  1  0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/  38 **** **** 4.62 4.68 ****
 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  20   0  1  0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/  39 **** **** 4.27 4.38 ****
 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 20  0  1  0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/  31 **** **** 4.47 4.51 ****


            Self  Paced
 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 20 0 1 0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/  28 **** **** 4.64 3.33 ****
 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    20   0  1  0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/  16 **** **** 4.67 4.00 ****
 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     20   0  1  0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/  27 **** **** 4.54 2.63 ****
 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      20   0  1  0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/  10 **** **** 4.84 **** ****
 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    20   0  1  0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/   6 **** **** 4.92 **** ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: ENGL 393  0601              University of Maryland                        Page  776
Title        TECHNICAL WRITING                 Baltimore County                          AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   HESS, LAURIE                        Spring 2008                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires: 15                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                           Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
          General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  5  3  4  1  2  2.47 1655/1670  3.53 4.16  4.31 4.24  2.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  4  1  3  3  4  3.13 1592/1666  3.90 4.21  4.27 4.18  3.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  10  0  0  1  0  4  4.60  495/1406  4.33 4.42  4.32 4.22  4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   1  2  4  1  3  4  3.21 1541/1615  4.03 4.31  4.24 4.18  3.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  2  4  0  2  2  4  3.17 1440/1566  3.66 4.16  4.07 4.04  3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  0  3  2  3  1  5  3.21 1410/1528  4.01 4.35  4.12 4.07  3.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  3  0  4  4  4  3.40 1503/1650  3.88 4.06  4.22 4.12  3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   1  0  0  0  1 13  4.93  540/1667  4.51 4.50  4.67 4.67  4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  0  0  0  9  2  1  3.33 1462/1626  3.61 4.14  4.11 4.06  3.33


          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       3   0  3  3  1  3  2  2.83 1530/1559  3.91 4.32  4.46 4.40  2.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3   0  1  1  2  1  7  4.00 1467/1560  4.37 4.73  4.72 4.67  4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  3  4  0  2  3  2.83 1510/1549  3.99 4.33  4.31 4.25  2.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    3   0  5  2  0  2  3  2.67 1517/1546  3.65 4.26  4.32 4.24  2.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  1  3  1  1  2  3  3.10 1173/1323  3.73 3.76  4.00 3.99  3.10


          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0  1  2  2  2  1  3.00 1260/1384  3.69 4.28  4.10 4.12  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0  0  0  3  2  2  3.86 1074/1378  4.08 4.47  4.29 4.30  3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8  0  0  1  2  2  2  3.71 1130/1378  3.91 4.54  4.31 4.33  3.71
4. Were special techniques successful                 9   1  1  1  0  2  1  3.20  802/ 904  3.40 4.01  4.03 4.03  3.20


          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 12  1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 232  **** ****  4.19 4.04  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 239  **** ****  4.21 3.99  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 230  **** ****  4.44 4.25  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          13   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 231  **** ****  4.31 4.11  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 218  **** ****  4.18 3.93  ****


          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  87  **** 4.83  4.65 4.30  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  79  **** 4.38  4.64 4.53  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  75  **** 4.50  4.57 4.50  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   13   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  79  **** 4.00  4.45 3.68  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               13   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  80  **** 4.33  3.97 3.76  ****


          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  41  **** ****  4.50 4.44  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  38  **** ****  4.19 3.96  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      13   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  38  **** ****  4.62 4.68  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  13   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  39  **** ****  4.27 4.38  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  31  **** ****  4.47 4.51  ****


          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  28  **** ****  4.64 3.33  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   13   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  16  **** ****  4.67 4.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     13   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  27  **** ****  4.54 2.63  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      13   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  10  **** ****  4.84 ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    13   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/   6  **** ****  4.92 ****  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 393  0801            University of Maryland                        Page  777
Title          TECHNICAL WRITING             Baltimore County                          AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    SIMS, DIANA                    Spring 2008                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    23
Questionnaires: 17                Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                      Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank   Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  4  1  5  3  4 3.12 1614/1670  3.53 4.16  4.31 4.24  3.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  3  2  5  3  4 3.18 1586/1666  3.90 4.21  4.27 4.18  3.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  10  2  0  0  2  3 3.57 1257/1406  4.33 4.42  4.32 4.22  3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1  2  5  2  4  3 3.06 1562/1615  4.03 4.31  4.24 4.18  3.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1  3  3  3  4  3 3.06 1467/1566  3.66 4.16  4.07 4.04  3.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  4  2  4  2  4 3.00 1447/1528  4.01 4.35  4.12 4.07  3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  6  1  6  2  2 2.59 1620/1650  3.88 4.06  4.22 4.12  2.59
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  1  0 14  2 4.00 1524/1667  4.51 4.50  4.67 4.67  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1  7  2  2  3  0 2.07 1611/1626  3.61 4.14  4.11 4.06  2.07


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  3  6  4  1  2 2.56 1539/1559  3.91 4.32  4.46 4.40  2.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  4  5  7 4.19 1431/1560  4.37 4.73  4.72 4.67  4.19
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  4  3  5  2  2 2.69 1517/1549  3.99 4.33  4.31 4.25  2.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  6  3  2  3  2 2.50 1523/1546  3.65 4.26  4.32 4.24  2.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  0  6  3  1  2  4 2.69 1257/1323  3.73 3.76  4.00 3.99  2.69


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5   0  5  1  2  2  2 2.58 1328/1384  3.69 4.28  4.10 4.12  2.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5   0  1  1  4  3  3 3.50 1193/1378  4.08 4.47  4.29 4.30  3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0  3  1  3  4  1 2.92 1319/1378  3.91 4.54  4.31 4.33  2.92
4. Were special techniques successful                   5   2  2  3  2  1  2 2.80  852/ 904  3.40 4.01  4.03 4.03  2.80

                                  Frequency Distribution

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

```
Enrollment:    23
Questionnaires:  22                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  1  1  10  10  4.32   929/1670   3.53  4.16  4.31  4.24  4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  1  0   6  15  4.59   503/1666   3.90  4.21  4.27  4.18  4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   7  0  1  0   3  11  4.60   495/1406   4.33  4.42  4.32  4.22  4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0   8  14  4.64   412/1615   4.03  4.31  4.24  4.18  4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  5   5  12  4.32   579/1566   3.66  4.16  4.07  4.04  4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  3   6  13  4.45   490/1528   4.01  4.35  4.12  4.07  4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  1   3  18  4.77   255/1650   3.88  4.06  4.22  4.12  4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   1  0  0  0  17   4  4.19  1409/1667   4.51  4.50  4.67  4.67  4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  0  11  10  4.48   451/1626   3.61  4.14  4.11  4.06  4.48


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0   7  15  4.68   640/1559   3.91  4.32  4.46  4.40  4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0   2  20  4.91   596/1560   4.37  4.73  4.72  4.67  4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0   6  16  4.73   410/1549   3.99  4.33  4.31  4.25  4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  3   7  12  4.41   849/1546   3.65  4.26  4.32  4.24  4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  2  0  0  5   6   8  4.16   619/1323   3.73  3.76  4.00  3.99  4.16


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13  0  1  1  1   5   1  3.44  1125/1384   3.69  4.28  4.10  4.12  3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13  0  0  0  1   3   5  4.44   672/1378   4.08  4.47  4.29  4.30  4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0  0  2  0   1   6  4.22   883/1378   3.91  4.54  4.31  4.33  4.22
4. Were special techniques successful                   13  6  0  0  0   2   1  4.33  ****/ 904   3.40  4.01  4.03  4.03  ****


              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 21 0 0  0  0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 239   ****  ****  4.21  3.99  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21  0  0  0  0   0   1  5.00  ****/  87   ****  4.83  4.65  4.30  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 0  0  0  0   0   1  5.00  ****/  79   ****  4.38  4.64  4.53  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21  0  0  0  0   0   1  5.00  ****/  75   ****  4.50  4.57  4.50  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     21  0  0  0  0   0   1  5.00  ****/  79   ****  4.00  4.45  3.68  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 21  0  0  0  0   1   0  4.00  ****/  80   ****  4.33  3.97  3.76  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  21  0  0  0  1   0   0  3.00  ****/  41   ****  ****  4.50  4.44  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  21  0  0  0  0   0   1  5.00  ****/  38   ****  ****  4.19  3.96  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        21  0  0  0  0   0   1  5.00  ****/  38   ****  ****  4.62  4.68  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    21  0  0  0  0   0   1  5.00  ****/  39   ****  ****  4.27  4.38  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  21  0  0  0  0   1   0  4.00  ****/  31   ****  ****  4.47  4.51  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21  0  1  0  0   0   0  1.00  ****/  28   ****  ****  4.64  3.33  ****


                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0        A   17      Required for Majors  0      Graduate     0      Major        2
28-55      0        1.00-1.99    1        B    3                                                      
56-83      4        2.00-2.99    1        C    1      General              4      Under-grad  22      Non-major   20
84-150    14        3.00-3.49    8        D    0                                                      
Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    8        F    0      Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                 responses to be significant
```

```
I       0               Other                   16
?       0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 393  1001            University of Maryland                         Page  779
Title        TECHNICAL WRITING             Baltimore County                             AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  SIMS, DIANA                   Spring 2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     22
Questionnaires: 16              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0  1  3  6  6  4.06 1183/1670  3.53  4.16  4.31 4.24  4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0  0  3  4  9  4.38  821/1666  3.90  4.21  4.27 4.18  4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   4   0  0  1  6  5  4.33  799/1406  4.33  4.42  4.32 4.22  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0  0  1  4 11  4.63  423/1615  4.03  4.31  4.24 4.18  4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0  1  2  5  8  4.25  643/1566  3.66  4.16  4.07 4.04  4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  2  4 10  4.50  421/1528  4.01  4.35  4.12 4.07  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0  0  2  2 11  4.60  429/1650  3.88  4.06  4.22 4.12  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0  0  1  0 15  4.88  730/1667  4.51  4.50  4.67 4.67  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1  0  0  0  7  3  4.30  670/1626  3.61  4.14  4.11 4.06  4.30


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0  0  1  5  9  4.53  858/1559  3.91  4.32  4.46 4.40  4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0  0  0  3 12  4.80  855/1560  4.37  4.73  4.72 4.67  4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0  0  0  3 12  4.80  294/1549  3.99  4.33  4.31 4.25  4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0  0  0  4 11  4.73  432/1546  3.65  4.26  4.32 4.24  4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0   1  0  1  3  8  4.31  507/1323  3.73  3.76  4.00 3.99  4.31


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0   0  0  1  2  7  4.60  372/1384  3.69  4.28  4.10 4.12  4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0   0  0  3  0  7  4.40  718/1378  4.08  4.47  4.29 4.30  4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0  0  0  1  2  7  4.60  590/1378  3.91  4.54  4.31 4.33  4.60
4. Were special techniques successful                  6   1   1  0  2  3  3  3.78  619/ 904  3.40  4.01  4.03 4.03  3.78


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 12   2   0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 232 ****  ****  4.19 4.04  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 239 ****  ****  4.21 3.99  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 15 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 230 ****  ****  4.44 4.25  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          15   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 231 ****  ****  4.31 4.11  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 15  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 218 ****  ****  4.18 3.93  ****


            Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  79 ****  4.38  4.64 4.53  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  75 ****  4.50  4.57 4.50  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   15   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  79 ****  4.00  4.45 3.68  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               15   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  80 ****  4.33  3.97 3.76  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15  0   1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  41 ****  ****  4.50 4.44  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15  0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  38 ****  ****  4.19 3.96  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      15   0   1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  38 ****  ****  4.62 4.68  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 15 0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  28 ****  ****  4.64 3.33  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   15   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  16 ****  ****  4.67 4.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     15   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  27 ****  ****  4.54 2.63  ****
```

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 16   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   0   0.00-0.99   0   A   11   Required for Majors   4   Graduate   0   Major   0
 28-55   2   1.00-1.99   0   B   1
 56-83   1   2.00-2.99   2   C   3   General   1   Under-grad 16   Non-major   16
 84-150   4   3.00-3.49   4   D   0
 Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   3   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0   responses to be significant
                                         I   0   Other   9
                                         ?   0

```
Course-Section: ENGL 393E 0101                University of Maryland                        Page   780
Title       TECHNICAL WRITING                   Baltimore County                          AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  SLYTHOMPSON, AL                      Spring 2008                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   17
Questionnaires: 13                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                              Frequencies        Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                 NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   3   3   0   3   4  3.15 1609/1670  3.15 4.16  4.31 4.24  3.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   2   1   3   3   3  3.33 1564/1666  3.33 4.21  4.27 4.18  3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   4   1   3   2   2   1  2.89 1375/1406  2.89 4.42  4.32 4.22  2.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   4   0   2   2   5  3.31 1519/1615  3.31 4.31  4.24 4.18  3.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1   5   0   3   1   3  2.75 1527/1566  2.75 4.16  4.07 4.04  2.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  1   3   2   1   4   2  3.00 1447/1528  3.00 4.35  4.12 4.07  3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   1   1   4   1   1   4  3.27 1536/1650  3.27 4.06  4.22 4.12  3.27
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0  13  5.00    1/1667  5.00 4.50  4.67 4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  1   0   3   3   1   2  3.22 1501/1626  3.22 4.14  4.11 4.06  3.22


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   3   3   2   2   3  2.92 1526/1559  2.92 4.32  4.46 4.40  2.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   2   0   4   2   5  3.62 1517/1560  3.62 4.73  4.72 4.67  3.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   1   4   2   2   3  3.17 1474/1549  3.17 4.33  4.31 4.25  3.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   1   3   1   1   2   4  3.27 1438/1546  3.27 4.26  4.32 4.24  3.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  5   1   0   1   2   2  3.67  960/1323  3.67 3.76  4.00 3.99  3.67


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0   2   1   4   1   1  2.78 1311/1384  2.78 4.28  4.10 4.12  2.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0   2   1   1   3   2  3.22 1271/1378  3.22 4.47  4.29 4.30  3.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0   1   2   4   1   1  2.89 1322/1378  2.89 4.54  4.31 4.33  2.89
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   2   3   0   1   2   1  2.71  857/ 904  2.71 4.01  4.03 4.03  2.71


               Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 12  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  28  **** ****  4.64 3.33  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    12   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  16  **** ****  4.67 4.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      12   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  27  **** ****  4.54 2.63  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       12   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  10  **** ****  4.84 ****  ****

                                 Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                    Majors

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0        0.00-0.99   0         A    8        Required for Majors  1      Graduate      1        Major        0
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99   0         B    3                                                 
  56-83      0        2.00-2.99   1         C    0        General              0      Under-grad   12        Non-major   13
  84-150     3        3.00-3.49   0         D    0
  Grad.      1        3.50-4.00   2         F    0        Electives            1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                            I    0        Other                9
                                            ?    0
```

```
                                                  Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                       NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   1   4   4  4.33   902/1670  4.50  4.16  4.31  4.45  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   2   3   3  3.89  1331/1666  4.24  4.21  4.27  4.35  3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   1   3   2   3  3.78  1198/1406  4.32  4.42  4.32  4.48  3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   1   3   2   2  3.63  1405/1615  4.15  4.31  4.24  4.37  3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   3   2   4  4.11   780/1566  4.46  4.16  4.07  4.17  4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0   4   2   3  3.89  1055/1528  4.28  4.35  4.12  4.26  3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   2   3   1   3  3.56  1445/1650  4.14  4.06  4.22  4.28  3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   8   1  4.11  1465/1667  4.49  4.50  4.67  4.73  4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0  0   4   4   0  3.50  1384/1626  3.92  4.14  4.11  4.28  3.50


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   1   3   2   3  3.78  1403/1559  4.32  4.32  4.46  4.58  3.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   2   1   6  4.44  1294/1560  4.62  4.73  4.72  4.80  4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   1   2   3   3  3.89  1246/1549  4.12  4.33  4.31  4.43  3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   1   2   1   5  4.11  1095/1546  4.34  4.26  4.32  4.43  4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 6 1  0   1   0   1  3.00  1179/1323  3.58  3.76  4.00  4.10  3.00


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   0   3   1   4  4.13   777/1384  4.44  4.28  4.10  4.32  4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0   0   0   4   0   4  4.00   970/1378  4.42  4.47  4.29  4.55  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0  1   2   2   3  3.88  1064/1378  4.40  4.54  4.31  4.60  3.88
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   3   0   0   2   0   3  4.20   405/ 904  4.46  4.01  4.03  4.22  4.20
```

                                        Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                      Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0         0.00-0.99    0        A    1       Required for Majors   1     Graduate      0        Major        8
28-55      0         1.00-1.99    0        B    6                                   Under-grad    9        Non-major    1
56-83      2         2.00-2.99    2        C    0       General               0     Under-grad    9        Non-major    1
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
                                          P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                          I    0       Other                 6
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 401  0201            University of Maryland                              Page  782
Title       METHOD OF INTERPRETATI              Baltimore County                          AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   STEWART, CAROLE                    Spring 2008                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    16
Questionnaires:  15              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  1  3 11  4.67  479/1670  4.50  4.16  4.31  4.45  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  6  9  4.60  490/1666  4.24  4.21  4.27  4.35  4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  2 13  4.87  219/1406  4.32  4.42  4.32  4.48  4.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  5 10  4.67  379/1615  4.15  4.31  4.24  4.37  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  3 12  4.80  187/1566  4.46  4.16  4.07  4.17  4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  1  3 11  4.67  300/1528  4.28  4.35  4.12  4.26  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  4 11  4.73  289/1650  4.14  4.06  4.22  4.28  4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  2 13  4.87  749/1667  4.49  4.50  4.67  4.73  4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0  0  0  6  3  4.33  637/1626  3.92  4.14  4.11  4.28  4.33


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  2 12  4.86  355/1559  4.32  4.32  4.46  4.58  4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  3 11  4.79  892/1560  4.62  4.73  4.72  4.80  4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  2  5  7  4.36  876/1549  4.12  4.33  4.31  4.43  4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  1  4  9  4.57  631/1546  4.34  4.26  4.32  4.43  4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 1 1  0  0  6  5  4.17  612/1323  3.58  3.76  4.00  4.10  4.17


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  0  3  9  4.75  257/1384  4.44  4.28  4.10  4.32  4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  0  0  2 10  4.83  316/1378  4.42  4.47  4.29  4.55  4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0  0  0  1 11  4.92  253/1378  4.40  4.54  4.31  4.60  4.92
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   1  0  0  0  3  8  4.73  156/ 904  4.46  4.01  4.03  4.22  4.73

                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                   Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1         0.00-0.99   0        A    4      Required for Majors   0     Graduate     0       Major       14
  28-55     0         1.00-1.99   0        B    9                                 
  56-83     0         2.00-2.99   3        C    2      General               0     Under-grad  15       Non-major    1
  84-150   10         3.00-3.49   8        D    0
  Grad.     0         3.50-4.00   2        F    0      Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                           I    0      Other                14
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 407  0101                University of Maryland                                    Page  783
Title      LANGUAGE IN SOCIETY                     Baltimore County                                   AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   MCCARTHY, LUCIL                        Spring 2008                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   17
Questionnaires: 13                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  1  2 10  4.69  440/1670  4.69  4.16  4.31  4.45  4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  2  2  9  4.54  582/1666  4.54  4.21  4.27  4.35  4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  11  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/1406  ****  4.42  4.32  4.48  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  0  0  2 10  4.83  224/1615  4.83  4.31  4.24  4.37  4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  1 12  4.92  105/1566  4.92  4.16  4.07  4.17  4.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  0  2 11  4.85  152/1528  4.85  4.35  4.12  4.26  4.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  1  2  2  8  4.31  844/1650  4.31  4.06  4.22  4.28  4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  1  7  5  4.31 1334/1667  4.31  4.50  4.67  4.73  4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0  0  4  9  4.69  255/1626  4.69  4.14  4.11  4.28  4.69


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4   0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  307/1559  4.89  4.32  4.46  4.58  4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   4   0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  647/1560  4.89  4.73  4.72  4.80  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5  0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  229/1549  4.88  4.33  4.31  4.43  4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4   0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  253/1546  4.89  4.26  4.32  4.43  4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 4 1 0  1  0  2  3.50 1040/1323  3.50  3.76  4.00  4.10  3.50


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  179/1384  4.89  4.28  4.10  4.32  4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1378  5.00  4.47  4.29  4.55  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1378  5.00  4.54  4.31  4.60  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   1  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  116/ 904  4.88  4.01  4.03  4.22  4.88

                                    Frequency Distribution

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

Questionnaires: 8   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                                 Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                  Questions                NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   2   1   5  4.38   849/1670  4.38 4.16  4.31 4.45  4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0   0   1   2   4  4.43   751/1666  4.43 4.21  4.27 4.35  4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   3   0   0   1   0   4  4.60   495/1406  4.60 4.42  4.32 4.48  4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   2   2   4  4.25   874/1615  4.25 4.31  4.24 4.37  4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   1   0   7  4.75   226/1566  4.75 4.16  4.07 4.17  4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   0   1   0   7  4.75   221/1528  4.75 4.35  4.12 4.26  4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   1   1   6  4.63   406/1650  4.63 4.06  4.22 4.28  4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   4   4  4.50  1157/1667  4.50 4.50  4.67 4.73  4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0   0   0   0   7  5.00     1/1626  5.00 4.14  4.11 4.28  5.00


                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0   0   1   1   4  4.50   896/1559  4.50 4.32  4.46 4.58  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80   855/1560  4.80 4.73  4.72 4.80  4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0   0   0   1   0   4  4.60   562/1549  4.60 4.33  4.31 4.43  4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0   0   0   1   1   3  4.40   849/1546  4.40 4.26  4.32 4.43  4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 2  0   0   1   0   2  4.33   481/1323  4.33 3.76  4.00 4.10  4.33


                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0   0   0   1   0   5  4.67   324/1384  4.67 4.28  4.10 4.32  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0   0   0   1   1   4  4.50   603/1378  4.50 4.47  4.29 4.55  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0   0   1   0   5  4.67   531/1378  4.67 4.54  4.31 4.60  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   1   0   0   0   0   4  5.00     1/ 904  5.00 4.01  4.03 4.22  5.00
```

                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 442  0101                University of Maryland                              Page  785
Title        VISUAL LITERACY                    Baltimore County                               AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  BURGESS, HELEN                       Spring 2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    17
Questionnaires: 13                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
         -------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  2  0  0  0  2  2  7  4.45  737/1670   4.45  4.16  4.31  4.45  4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   3  0  0  0  2  4  4  4.20 1037/1666   4.20  4.21  4.27  4.35  4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   3  1  0  0  0  6  3  4.33  775/1615   4.33  4.31  4.24  4.37  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  1  1  1  6  4.33  559/1566   4.33  4.16  4.07  4.17  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  0  2  3  4  4.22  733/1528   4.22  4.35  4.12  4.26  4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           4  0  0  3  2  0  4  3.56 1445/1650   3.56  4.06  4.22  4.28  3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled                 4  0  0  0  5  4  0  3.44 1652/1667   3.44  4.50  4.67  4.73  3.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  0  0  0  2  5  3  4.10  900/1626   4.10  4.14  4.11  4.28  4.10


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       4  0  0  0  3  3  3  4.00 1280/1559   4.00  4.32  4.46  4.58  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  4  0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  647/1560   4.89  4.73  4.72  4.80  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0  0  1  3  2  3  3.78 1299/1549   3.78  4.33  4.31  4.43  3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    4  0  0  1  3  1  4  3.89 1240/1546   3.89  4.26  4.32  4.43  3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6  4  1  0  0  2  0  3.00 ****/1323   ****  3.76  4.00  4.10  ****


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  2  3  5  4.30  638/1384   4.30  4.28  4.10  4.32  4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  0  1  0  9  4.80  348/1378   4.80  4.47  4.29  4.55  4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  281/1378   4.90  4.54  4.31  4.60  4.90
4. Were special techniques successful                 4  6  0  0  2  1  0  3.33 ****/ 904   ****  4.01  4.03  4.22  ****


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 11  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  87   ****  4.83  4.65  4.80  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 11  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  79   ****  4.38  4.64  4.60  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 11  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  75   ****  4.50  4.57  4.56  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   11  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  79   ****  4.00  4.45  4.53  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               11  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  80   ****  4.33  3.97  3.67  ****

                               Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades      Reasons                Type                Majors
         -------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1     0.00-0.99    0      A    7     Required for Majors   0     Graduate      0     Major      12
  28-55      0     1.00-1.99    0      B    6
  56-83      1     2.00-2.99    2      C    0     General               1     Under-grad   13     Non-major   1
  84-150     5     3.00-3.49    4      D    0
  Grad.      0     3.50-4.00    5      F    0     Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0     Other                12
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 448  0101                University of Maryland                           Page  786
Title        SEMINAR IN LIT & CULTU              Baltimore County                            AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  DONOVAN, JULIE                        Spring 2008                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      9
Questionnaires:  8                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean      Rank      Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   0   1   7  4.88   234/1670   4.88 4.16  4.31 4.45  4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   0   8  5.00     1/1666   5.00 4.21  4.27 4.35  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   3   0   0   0   0   5  5.00     1/1406   5.00 4.42  4.32 4.48  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   0   0   1   6  4.86   210/1615   4.86 4.31  4.24 4.37  4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1   0   0   0   0   7  5.00     1/1566   5.00 4.16  4.07 4.17  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0   0   0   0   7  5.00     1/1528   5.00 4.35  4.12 4.26  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   0   2   6  4.75   272/1650   4.75 4.06  4.22 4.28  4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   1   7  4.88   730/1667   4.88 4.50  4.67 4.73  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0   0   0   0   5  5.00     1/1626   5.00 4.14  4.11 4.28  5.00

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0   0   0   2   4  4.67   673/1559   4.67 4.32  4.46 4.58  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0   0   0   0   0   5  5.00     1/1560   5.00 4.73  4.72 4.80  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80   294/1549   4.80 4.33  4.31 4.43  4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0   0   0   0   0   5  5.00     1/1546   5.00 4.26  4.32 4.43  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0  0   0   0   1   3  4.75   183/1323   4.75 3.76  4.00 4.10  4.75

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   0   0   0   7  5.00     1/1384   5.00 4.28  4.10 4.32  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0   0   0   0   0   7  5.00     1/1378   5.00 4.47  4.29 4.55  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0  0   0   0   0   7  5.00     1/1378   5.00 4.54  4.31 4.60  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   1   1   0   0   0   5  4.33   328/ 904   4.33 4.01  4.03 4.22  4.33

                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00     1/  87   5.00 4.83  4.65 4.80  5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 0  0   0   0   0   2  5.00     1/  79   5.00 4.38  4.64 4.60  5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 6  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00     1/  75   5.00 4.50  4.57 4.56  5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    6   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00     1/  79   5.00 4.00  4.45 4.53  5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                6   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00     1/  80   5.00 4.33  3.97 3.67  5.00
```

                         Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 480  0101              University of Maryland                        Page  787
Title       SEMINAR-ADV JOURNALISM              Baltimore County                        AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   CORBETT, CHRIS                      Spring 2008                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   12
Questionnaires:  11                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  4  7  4.64  518/1670  4.64  4.16  4.31  4.45  4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  6  5  4.45  703/1666  4.45  4.21  4.27  4.35  4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   7  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  318/1406  4.75  4.42  4.32  4.48  4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  4  7  4.64  412/1615  4.64  4.31  4.24  4.37  4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82  181/1566  4.82  4.16  4.07  4.17  4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1  5  5  4.36  600/1528  4.36  4.35  4.12  4.26  4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  0  3  6  1  3.55 1448/1650  3.55  4.06  4.22  4.28  3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  1  0  0  2  8  4.45 1206/1667  4.45  4.50  4.67  4.73  4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0  3  7  4.70  255/1626  4.70  4.14  4.11  4.28  4.70


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  1  5  5  4.36 1062/1559  4.36  4.32  4.46  4.58  4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1560  5.00  4.73  4.72  4.80  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  3  8  4.73  410/1549  4.73  4.33  4.31  4.43  4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  1  2  8  4.64  557/1546  4.64  4.26  4.32  4.43  4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 3  2  6  4.27  529/1323  4.27  3.76  4.00  4.10  4.27


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  3  8  4.73  278/1384  4.73  4.28  4.10  4.32  4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0  0  0  1  2  8  4.64  503/1378  4.64  4.47  4.29  4.55  4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 1  0 10  4.82  375/1378  4.82  4.54  4.31  4.60  4.82
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   7  0  1  0  1  2  4.00  461/ 904  4.00  4.01  4.03  4.22  4.00


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  87  ****  4.83  4.65  4.80  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  4.38  4.64  4.60  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  75  ****  4.50  4.57  4.56  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    10   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  4.00  4.45  4.53  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                10   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  4.33  3.97  3.67  ****

                          Frequency Distribution

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

Enrollment: 2
Questionnaires: 2   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                        Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean      Rank       Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 1216/1670  4.00  4.16  4.31  4.45  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 1199/1666  4.00  4.21  4.27  4.35  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1615  5.00  4.31  4.24  4.37  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1566  5.00  4.16  4.07  4.17  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   1   0   0   1  3.50 1274/1528  3.50  4.35  4.12  4.26  3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 1135/1650  4.00  4.06  4.22  4.28  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 1157/1667  4.50  4.50  4.67  4.73  4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0   0   1   0   1  4.00  953/1626  4.00  4.14  4.11  4.28  4.00


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  434/1384  4.50  4.28  4.10  4.32  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 1193/1378  3.50  4.47  4.29  4.55  3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  0   0   0   1   1  4.50  653/1378  4.50  4.54  4.31  4.60  4.50


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 0  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50   65/  87  4.50  4.83  4.65  4.80  4.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 0 0  0   1   0   0   1  3.50   75/  79  3.50  4.38  4.64  4.60  3.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00   58/  75  4.00  4.50  4.57  4.56  4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    0   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00   62/  79  4.00  4.00  4.45  4.53  4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                0   1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00   37/  80  4.00  4.33  3.97  3.67  4.00
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 649  0101            University of Maryland                          Page  789
Title       GENRE ANALYSIS                  Baltimore County                            AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  MAHER, JENNIFER                   Spring 2008                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     1
Questionnaires:  1                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1670  5.00  4.16  4.31  4.46  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1666  5.00  4.21  4.27  4.34  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1615  5.00  4.31  4.24  4.33  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1566  5.00  4.16  4.07  4.20  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1528  5.00  4.35  4.12  4.33  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1650  5.00  4.06  4.22  4.30  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1667  5.00  4.50  4.67  4.74  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1626  5.00  4.14  4.11  4.20  5.00


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1559  5.00  4.32  4.46  4.49  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1560  5.00  4.73  4.72  4.81  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1549  5.00  4.33  4.31  4.37  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1546  5.00  4.26  4.32  4.40  5.00


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1384  5.00  4.28  4.10  4.21  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1378  5.00  4.47  4.29  4.42  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1378  5.00  4.54  4.31  4.51  5.00

                                      Frequency Distribution

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