

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0101  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 693  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	2	3	3	0	2.55	1565/1576	3.76	4.12	4.30	4.11	2.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	2	2	4	0	2.64	1561/1576	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.18	2.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	0	4	2	1	3.25	1269/1342	4.20	4.32	4.32	4.19	3.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	1	4	2	1	2.90	1489/1520	4.08	4.32	4.25	4.09	2.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	2	3	2	0	2.56	1446/1465	3.73	4.16	4.12	4.02	2.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	3	2	3.18	1332/1434	4.14	4.31	4.14	3.94	3.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	3	1	4	1	3.33	1396/1547	3.76	4.07	4.19	4.10	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	6	5	0	3.45	1559/1574	4.30	4.43	4.64	4.59	3.45	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	6	1	0	2.78	1504/1554	3.75	4.08	4.10	4.01	2.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	4	1	2	3.00	1452/1488	4.18	4.35	4.47	4.41	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1467/1493	4.61	4.72	4.73	4.65	3.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	0	4	1	2	2.90	1444/1486	4.13	4.30	4.32	4.26	2.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	4	1	3	0	2.50	1466/1489	4.03	4.24	4.32	4.22	2.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	1260/1277	3.55	3.63	4.03	3.91	2.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	3	2	0	2.71	1233/1279	3.75	4.22	4.17	3.96	2.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	3	4	0	3.25	1181/1270	4.22	4.49	4.35	4.09	3.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	0	3	2	1	3.00	1210/1269	4.24	4.48	4.35	4.09	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	2	2	0	1	2.67	843/ 878	3.73	4.02	4.05	3.91	2.67	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	10	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.01	3.85	4.20	4.15	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	10	0	1	3.18	259/ 375	3.04	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.18	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.06	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.07	3.22	4.08	3.86	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	952/1576	3.76	4.12	4.30	4.11	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	608/1576	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	583/1342	4.20	4.32	4.32	4.19	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	1012/1520	4.08	4.32	4.25	4.09	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	818/1465	3.73	4.16	4.12	4.02	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	806/1434	4.14	4.31	4.14	3.94	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	1	10	4.13	955/1547	3.76	4.07	4.19	4.10	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	328/1574	4.30	4.43	4.64	4.59	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	10	1	3.92	1032/1554	3.75	4.08	4.10	4.01	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	834/1488	4.18	4.35	4.47	4.41	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	390/1493	4.61	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	499/1486	4.13	4.30	4.32	4.26	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	579/1489	4.03	4.24	4.32	4.22	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	2	0	3	4	3.70	923/1277	3.55	3.63	4.03	3.91	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	774/1279	3.75	4.22	4.17	3.96	4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	447/1270	4.22	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	479/1269	4.24	4.48	4.35	4.09	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	179/ 878	3.73	4.02	4.05	3.91	4.63
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	13	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.01	3.85	4.20	4.15	4.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	12	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.04	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	13	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.06	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	12	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.07	3.22	4.08	3.86	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	6
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
			Required for Majors	12	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	16
			Other	4	Major
					0
					Non-major
					16
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0301  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: TERHORST, RAYMO  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 695  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	8	10	4.29	916/1576	3.76	4.12	4.30	4.11	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	462/1576	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.18	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	406/1342	4.20	4.32	4.32	4.19	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	7	11	4.40	683/1520	4.08	4.32	4.25	4.09	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	483/1465	3.73	4.16	4.12	4.02	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	383/1434	4.14	4.31	4.14	3.94	4.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	4	11	4.24	860/1547	3.76	4.07	4.19	4.10	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	7	4.33	1262/1574	4.30	4.43	4.64	4.59	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	229/1554	3.75	4.08	4.10	4.01	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	547/1488	4.18	4.35	4.47	4.41	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	445/1493	4.61	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	211/1486	4.13	4.30	4.32	4.26	4.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	500/1489	4.03	4.24	4.32	4.22	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	236/1277	3.55	3.63	4.03	3.91	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	365/1279	3.75	4.22	4.17	3.96	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	541/1270	4.22	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	567/1269	4.24	4.48	4.35	4.09	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	164/ 878	3.73	4.02	4.05	3.91	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	3.83	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	3.20	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.00	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	3.50	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	14	0	3.93	296/ 379	4.01	3.85	4.20	4.15	3.93	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.58	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	4.13	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.43	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	14	1	0	3.07	284/ 375	3.04	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.07	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.50	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	3.50	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	3.75	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	13	0	1	3.14	237/ 326	3.06	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.14	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.38	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.25	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.25	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	4.38	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	16	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.07	3.22	4.08	3.86	3.00	

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0301  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: TERHORST, RAYMO  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 695  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0601  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 696  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	6	3	1	3.08	1531/1576	3.76	4.12	4.30	4.11	3.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	6	3	2	3.23	1488/1576	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.18	3.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1076/1342	4.20	4.32	4.32	4.19	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	4	3	3.54	1352/1520	4.08	4.32	4.25	4.09	3.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	1138/1465	3.73	4.16	4.12	4.02	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	844/1434	4.14	4.31	4.14	3.94	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	4	2	1	2	2.58	1512/1547	3.76	4.07	4.19	4.10	2.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	10	1	4.09	1427/1574	4.30	4.43	4.64	4.59	4.09	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	6	2	0	2.90	1485/1554	3.75	4.08	4.10	4.01	2.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	3	4	2	2	3.08	1448/1488	4.18	4.35	4.47	4.41	3.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	1355/1493	4.61	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	4	1	4	3.50	1330/1486	4.13	4.30	4.32	4.26	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	1	4	3.42	1341/1489	4.03	4.24	4.32	4.22	3.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	585/1277	3.55	3.63	4.03	3.91	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	981/1279	3.75	4.22	4.17	3.96	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	1151/1270	4.22	4.49	4.35	4.09	3.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1005/1269	4.24	4.48	4.35	4.09	3.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	709/ 878	3.73	4.02	4.05	3.91	3.50	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	8	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.01	3.85	4.20	4.15	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	10	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.04	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.06	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.07	3.22	4.08	3.86	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0701  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 697  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	2	5	4	1	2.75	1558/1576	3.76	4.12	4.30	4.11	2.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	6	5	1	3.13	1511/1576	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.18	3.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	6	4	2	3.54	1201/1342	4.20	4.32	4.32	4.19	3.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	0	8	3	3.60	1330/1520	4.08	4.32	4.25	4.09	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	3	5	1	3	3.15	1358/1465	3.73	4.16	4.12	4.02	3.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	5	3	4	3.47	1227/1434	4.14	4.31	4.14	3.94	3.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	3	3	4	2	2.81	1495/1547	3.76	4.07	4.19	4.10	2.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	14	0	3.88	1526/1574	4.30	4.43	4.64	4.59	3.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	1	5	2	0	2.70	1511/1554	3.75	4.08	4.10	4.01	2.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	3	2	7	1	1	2.64	1474/1488	4.18	4.35	4.47	4.41	2.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	1435/1493	4.61	4.72	4.73	4.65	3.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	1	5	3	2	3.00	1421/1486	4.13	4.30	4.32	4.26	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	2	2	3	4	3.21	1389/1489	4.03	4.24	4.32	4.22	3.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	1248/1277	3.55	3.63	4.03	3.91	2.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	1	5	1	1	2.64	1238/1279	3.75	4.22	4.17	3.96	2.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	3	5	0	3	3.27	1178/1270	4.22	4.49	4.35	4.09	3.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	5	2	3	3.64	1076/1269	4.24	4.48	4.35	4.09	3.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	2	4	2	0	1	2.33	858/ 878	3.73	4.02	4.05	3.91	2.33	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	8	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.01	3.85	4.20	4.15	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	11	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.04	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.06	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	10	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.07	3.22	4.08	3.86	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0901  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BLOOM, RYAN I.  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 698  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	8	5	5	3.68	1374/1576	3.76	4.12	4.30	4.11	3.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	9	4.05	1107/1576	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.18	4.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	835/1342	4.20	4.32	4.32	4.19	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	837/1520	4.08	4.32	4.25	4.09	4.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	6	7	3.89	996/1465	3.73	4.16	4.12	4.02	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	659/1434	4.14	4.31	4.14	3.94	4.28	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	827/1547	3.76	4.07	4.19	4.10	4.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	586/1574	4.30	4.43	4.64	4.59	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	11	3	4.06	892/1554	3.75	4.08	4.10	4.01	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	568/1488	4.18	4.35	4.47	4.41	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	708/1493	4.61	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	720/1486	4.13	4.30	4.32	4.26	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	7	10	4.26	948/1489	4.03	4.24	4.32	4.22	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	3	0	5	0	2	2.80	1203/1277	3.55	3.63	4.03	3.91	2.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	3	6	6	3.94	860/1279	3.75	4.22	4.17	3.96	3.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	666/1270	4.22	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	2	1	13	4.47	669/1269	4.24	4.48	4.35	4.09	4.47	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	435/ 878	3.73	4.02	4.05	3.91	4.13	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	3.20	4.35	4.29	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	0	12	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.01	3.85	4.20	4.15	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.58	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.13	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.43	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	12	0	2	3.29	240/ 375	3.04	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.29	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.50	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	3.50	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	3.75	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	9	1	0	3.10	247/ 326	3.06	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.10	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.38	4.60	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.25	4.67	4.68	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	1	0	0	10	0	1	3.18	286/ 382	3.07	3.22	4.08	3.86	3.18	

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0901  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BLOOM, RYAN I.  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 698  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						



Course-Section: ENGL 100 1201  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 699  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	3	5	4	3.44	1470/1576	3.76	4.12	4.30	4.11	3.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	5	4	3.63	1360/1576	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.18	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	4	5	2	3.27	1267/1342	4.20	4.32	4.32	4.19	3.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	6	4	3.63	1320/1520	4.08	4.32	4.25	4.09	3.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	7	5	0	2.93	1407/1465	3.73	4.16	4.12	4.02	2.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	6	2	4	3.40	1263/1434	4.14	4.31	4.14	3.94	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	3	2	2	5	3.20	1422/1547	3.76	4.07	4.19	4.10	3.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	1128/1574	4.30	4.43	4.64	4.59	4.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	2	4	4	3	1	2.79	1503/1554	3.75	4.08	4.10	4.01	2.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	4	6	4	3.80	1343/1488	4.18	4.35	4.47	4.41	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	1125/1493	4.61	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	3	5	5	3.80	1233/1486	4.13	4.30	4.32	4.26	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	4	5	2	3.20	1392/1489	4.03	4.24	4.32	4.22	3.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	1	4	5	1	3.15	1131/1277	3.55	3.63	4.03	3.91	3.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	2	4	0	2	2.80	1224/1279	3.75	4.22	4.17	3.96	2.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	928/1270	4.22	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	4	1	4	3.80	1018/1269	4.24	4.48	4.35	4.09	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	694/ 878	3.73	4.02	4.05	3.91	3.57	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	3.20	4.35	4.29	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	10	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.01	3.85	4.20	4.15	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.04	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	11	0	1	3.17	232/ 326	3.06	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.17	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.07	3.22	4.08	3.86	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 16	Non-major 15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 6		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1401  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 700  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	4	2	5	3.62	1405/1576	3.76	4.12	4.30	4.11	3.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	6	4.31	891/1576	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.18	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	1189/1342	4.20	4.32	4.32	4.19	3.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	3	7	4.08	1008/1520	4.08	4.32	4.25	4.09	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	6	2	3	3.50	1242/1465	3.73	4.16	4.12	4.02	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	544/1434	4.14	4.31	4.14	3.94	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	6	4	3.92	1124/1547	3.76	4.07	4.19	4.10	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	1288/1574	4.30	4.43	4.64	4.59	4.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1060/1554	3.75	4.08	4.10	4.01	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	1025/1488	4.18	4.35	4.47	4.41	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	784/1493	4.61	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	1197/1486	4.13	4.30	4.32	4.26	3.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1057/1489	4.03	4.24	4.32	4.22	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	0	1	5	3	3.64	958/1277	3.55	3.63	4.03	3.91	3.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	2	1	4	3.56	1043/1279	3.75	4.22	4.17	3.96	3.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	1011/1270	4.22	4.49	4.35	4.09	3.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	835/1269	4.24	4.48	4.35	4.09	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	580/ 878	3.73	4.02	4.05	3.91	3.86	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	208/ 379	4.01	3.85	4.20	4.15	4.10	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.04	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.06	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.07	3.22	4.08	3.86	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1501  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 701  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	9	4	4.00	1148/1576	3.76	4.12	4.30	4.11	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	13	4.59	502/1576	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.18	4.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	541/1342	4.20	4.32	4.32	4.19	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	13	4.59	418/1520	4.08	4.32	4.25	4.09	4.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	2	5	6	3.75	1102/1465	3.73	4.16	4.12	4.02	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	704/1434	4.14	4.31	4.14	3.94	4.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	0	12	4.29	794/1547	3.76	4.07	4.19	4.10	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	5	4.29	1295/1574	4.30	4.43	4.64	4.59	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	6	7	4	3.88	1074/1554	3.75	4.08	4.10	4.01	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	957/1488	4.18	4.35	4.47	4.41	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	908/1493	4.61	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	911/1486	4.13	4.30	4.32	4.26	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	1	11	4.44	777/1489	4.03	4.24	4.32	4.22	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	4	3	6	3.80	856/1277	3.55	3.63	4.03	3.91	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	957/1279	3.75	4.22	4.17	3.96	3.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	928/1270	4.22	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	5	4	3	3.62	1082/1269	4.24	4.48	4.35	4.09	3.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	2	3	4	1	3.18	782/ 878	3.73	4.02	4.05	3.91	3.18	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 234	****	3.83	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	3.20	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 229	****	4.00	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 232	****	3.50	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	200/ 379	4.01	3.85	4.20	4.15	4.13	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	13	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.04	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	11	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.06	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	5	0	1	3.33	250/ 382	3.07	3.22	4.08	3.86	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1601  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: PUTZEL, DIANE M  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 702  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	10	5	3.85	1283/1576	3.76	4.12	4.30	4.11	3.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	9	4.10	1076/1576	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.18	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	406/1342	4.20	4.32	4.32	4.19	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	994/1520	4.08	4.32	4.25	4.09	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	11	5	3.95	919/1465	3.73	4.16	4.12	4.02	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	7	11	4.25	682/1434	4.14	4.31	4.14	3.94	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	3	2	6	8	4.00	1041/1547	3.76	4.07	4.19	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	1003/1574	4.30	4.43	4.64	4.59	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	692/1554	3.75	4.08	4.10	4.01	4.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	624/1488	4.18	4.35	4.47	4.41	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	683/1493	4.61	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	763/1486	4.13	4.30	4.32	4.26	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	7	10	4.20	997/1489	4.03	4.24	4.32	4.22	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	600/1277	3.55	3.63	4.03	3.91	4.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	5	10	4.11	771/1279	3.75	4.22	4.17	3.96	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	532/1270	4.22	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	16	4.74	467/1269	4.24	4.48	4.35	4.09	4.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	451/ 878	3.73	4.02	4.05	3.91	4.08	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	3.20	4.35	4.29	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	13	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.01	3.85	4.20	4.15	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.04	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	9	0	1	3.20	223/ 326	3.06	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.20	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	7	0	1	3.25	269/ 382	3.07	3.22	4.08	3.86	3.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 20	Non-major 20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 5		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1801  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 703  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	1094/1576	3.76	4.12	4.30	4.11	4.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	1082/1576	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.18	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	4.20	4.32	4.32	4.19	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	614/1520	4.08	4.32	4.25	4.09	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	1	3	3	3.56	1225/1465	3.73	4.16	4.12	4.02	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	398/1434	4.14	4.31	4.14	3.94	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	971/1547	3.76	4.07	4.19	4.10	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	3	3	2	2	3.09	1566/1574	4.30	4.43	4.64	4.59	3.09	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	924/1554	3.75	4.08	4.10	4.01	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	401/1488	4.18	4.35	4.47	4.41	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	4.61	4.72	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	561/1486	4.13	4.30	4.32	4.26	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	579/1489	4.03	4.24	4.32	4.22	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	3.55	3.63	4.03	3.91	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	296/1279	3.75	4.22	4.17	3.96	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	307/1270	4.22	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	491/1269	4.24	4.48	4.35	4.09	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	3.73	4.02	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	8	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.01	3.85	4.20	4.15	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.04	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.06	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.07	3.22	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1901  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: FLANIGAN, SEAN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 704  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	568/1576	3.76	4.12	4.30	4.11	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	476/1576	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.18	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	443/1342	4.20	4.32	4.32	4.19	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	511/1520	4.08	4.32	4.25	4.09	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	4	11	4.30	596/1465	3.73	4.16	4.12	4.02	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	323/1434	4.14	4.31	4.14	3.94	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	4	5	7	3.70	1259/1547	3.76	4.07	4.19	4.10	3.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1574	4.30	4.43	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	477/1554	3.75	4.08	4.10	4.01	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	173/1488	4.18	4.35	4.47	4.41	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	810/1493	4.61	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	437/1486	4.13	4.30	4.32	4.26	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	406/1489	4.03	4.24	4.32	4.22	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	692/1277	3.55	3.63	4.03	3.91	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	4	1	5	3.75	962/1279	3.75	4.22	4.17	3.96	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	505/1270	4.22	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	535/1269	4.24	4.48	4.35	4.09	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	464/ 878	3.73	4.02	4.05	3.91	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.20	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.00	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	3.50	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	8	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.01	3.85	4.20	4.15	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.04	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.50	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	3.50	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.75	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	7	1	0	3.13	242/ 326	3.06	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.13	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.07	3.22	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 12			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 20	Non-major 19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 5		



Course-Section: ENGL 100 2001  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: WILKINSON, RACH  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 705  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	301/1576	3.76	4.12	4.30	4.11	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	448/1576	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.18	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	298/1342	4.20	4.32	4.32	4.19	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	96/1520	4.08	4.32	4.25	4.09	4.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	251/1465	3.73	4.16	4.12	4.02	4.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	193/1434	4.14	4.31	4.14	3.94	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	774/1547	3.76	4.07	4.19	4.10	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	1033/1574	4.30	4.43	4.64	4.59	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	558/1554	3.75	4.08	4.10	4.01	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	736/1488	4.18	4.35	4.47	4.41	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	1017/1493	4.61	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	678/1486	4.13	4.30	4.32	4.26	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	696/1489	4.03	4.24	4.32	4.22	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	791/1277	3.55	3.63	4.03	3.91	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	603/1279	3.75	4.22	4.17	3.96	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1270	4.22	4.49	4.35	4.09	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1269	4.24	4.48	4.35	4.09	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	400/ 878	3.73	4.02	4.05	3.91	4.20	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	11	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.01	3.85	4.20	4.15	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.04	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.06	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.07	3.22	4.08	3.86	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	7	3	3.65	1392/1576	3.79	4.12	4.30	4.11	3.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	9	3	3.71	1330/1576	4.16	4.22	4.27	4.18	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	972/1342	4.11	4.32	4.32	4.19	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	11	2	3.88	1185/1520	4.12	4.32	4.25	4.09	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	6	5	3.65	1180/1465	3.89	4.16	4.12	4.02	3.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	6	7	4.06	857/1434	4.06	4.31	4.14	3.94	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	4	5	4	3.56	1320/1547	3.97	4.07	4.19	4.10	3.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	942/1574	4.51	4.43	4.64	4.59	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	6	6	0	3.50	1303/1554	3.90	4.08	4.10	4.01	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	1103/1488	4.24	4.35	4.47	4.41	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	1184/1493	4.62	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	5	5	4	3.80	1233/1486	4.22	4.30	4.32	4.26	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	3	4	6	3.93	1169/1489	4.05	4.24	4.32	4.22	3.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	1	0	4	1	2	3.38	1074/1277	3.37	3.63	4.03	3.91	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	2	2	2	4	3.55	1047/1279	3.94	4.22	4.17	3.96	3.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	860/1270	4.23	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	909/1269	4.29	4.48	4.35	4.09	4.09	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	747/ 878	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.91	3.38	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	3.83	3.83	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	3.20	3.20	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	4.00	4.00	4.51	4.43	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.24	3.25	4.01	3.78	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.19	3.22	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	6	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0201  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 707  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	772/1576	3.79	4.12	4.30	4.11	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	267/1576	4.16	4.22	4.27	4.18	4.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1342	4.11	4.32	4.32	4.19	5.00		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	418/1520	4.12	4.32	4.25	4.09	4.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	193/1465	3.89	4.16	4.12	4.02	4.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	14	4.56	360/1434	4.06	4.31	4.14	3.94	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	2	11	4.35	737/1547	3.97	4.07	4.19	4.10	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	11	6	4.28	1309/1574	4.51	4.43	4.64	4.59	4.28	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	129/1554	3.90	4.08	4.10	4.01	4.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	401/1488	4.24	4.35	4.47	4.41	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1493	4.62	4.72	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	468/1486	4.22	4.30	4.32	4.26	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	240/1489	4.05	4.24	4.32	4.22	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	692/1277	3.37	3.63	4.03	3.91	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	219/1279	3.94	4.22	4.17	3.96	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	182/1270	4.23	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	194/1269	4.29	4.48	4.35	4.09	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	0	4	2	6	3.92	538/ 878	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.91	3.92	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	3.77	3.85	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.24	3.25	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.19	3.07	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.19	3.22	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0301  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 708  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	9	4	3.88	1266/1576	3.79	4.12	4.30	4.11	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	4	6	3.88	1253/1576	4.16	4.22	4.27	4.18	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	3	1	9	4.29	812/1342	4.11	4.32	4.32	4.19	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	3	7	4.00	1041/1520	4.12	4.32	4.25	4.09	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	7	5	4.00	850/1465	3.89	4.16	4.12	4.02	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	682/1434	4.06	4.31	4.14	3.94	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	4	9	4.25	838/1547	3.97	4.07	4.19	4.10	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1574	4.51	4.43	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	5	3	3	3.67	1227/1554	3.90	4.08	4.10	4.01	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	870/1488	4.24	4.35	4.47	4.41	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	1210/1493	4.62	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	821/1486	4.22	4.30	4.32	4.26	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	813/1489	4.05	4.24	4.32	4.22	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	1107/1277	3.37	3.63	4.03	3.91	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	745/1279	3.94	4.22	4.17	3.96	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	910/1270	4.23	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.07	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	760/1269	4.29	4.48	4.35	4.09	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	425/ 878	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.91	4.14	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	3.77	3.85	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.24	3.25	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.19	3.07	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.19	3.22	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0501  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: TAYLOR, PAUL  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 709  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	7	2	3.79	1333/1576	3.79	4.12	4.30	4.11	3.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	1040/1576	4.16	4.22	4.27	4.18	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	4	4	3.86	1089/1342	4.11	4.32	4.32	4.19	3.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	6	4	3.79	1241/1520	4.12	4.32	4.25	4.09	3.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	9	3	4.00	850/1465	3.89	4.16	4.12	4.02	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	8	3	4.00	878/1434	4.06	4.31	4.14	3.94	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	6	4	3	3.64	1285/1547	3.97	4.07	4.19	4.10	3.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	1302/1574	4.51	4.43	4.64	4.59	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	1	0	5	3	3.80	1132/1554	3.90	4.08	4.10	4.01	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	1142/1488	4.24	4.35	4.47	4.41	4.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	1337/1493	4.62	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.31	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	891/1486	4.22	4.30	4.32	4.26	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1080/1489	4.05	4.24	4.32	4.22	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	4	3	2	3.50	1020/1277	3.37	3.63	4.03	3.91	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	899/1279	3.94	4.22	4.17	3.96	3.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	636/1270	4.23	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	852/1269	4.29	4.48	4.35	4.09	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	464/ 878	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.91	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	190/ 234	3.83	3.83	4.23	4.08	3.83	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	230/ 240	3.20	3.20	4.35	4.29	3.20	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	203/ 229	4.00	4.00	4.51	4.43	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	206/ 232	3.50	3.50	4.29	4.27	3.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	2	0	2	0	3.00	373/ 379	3.77	3.85	4.20	4.15	3.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	83/ 85	3.50	4.58	4.72	4.52	3.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	67/ 79	4.00	4.67	4.69	4.52	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	72/ 72	3.00	4.13	4.64	4.43	3.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	77/ 80	3.75	4.43	4.61	4.55	3.75	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	223/ 375	3.24	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.40	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	40/ 52	4.00	4.00	4.48	4.20	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	42/ 48	3.50	3.50	4.40	4.11	3.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	43/ 44	3.50	3.50	4.73	4.71	3.50	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	43/ 45	3.75	3.75	4.57	4.72	3.75	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 326	3.19	3.07	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	35/ 40	3.75	4.38	4.60	4.44	3.75	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	24/ 24	3.50	4.25	4.83	4.71	3.50	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	33/ 35	3.50	4.25	4.67	4.68	3.50	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	28/ 28	3.75	4.38	4.78	4.65	3.75	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	219/ 382	3.19	3.22	4.08	3.86	3.50	

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0501  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: TAYLOR, PAUL  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 709  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	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	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	2	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0601  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 710  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	1	7	4	3.47	1456/1576	3.79	4.12	4.30	4.11	3.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	9	4.12	1067/1576	4.16	4.22	4.27	4.18	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1199/1342	4.11	4.32	4.32	4.19	3.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	8	6	4.00	1041/1520	4.12	4.32	4.25	4.09	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	4	4	3	3.06	1377/1465	3.89	4.16	4.12	4.02	3.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	3	6	4	3.41	1257/1434	4.06	4.31	4.14	3.94	3.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	0	2	4	7	3.75	1239/1547	3.97	4.07	4.19	4.10	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	4	4.24	1339/1574	4.51	4.43	4.64	4.59	4.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	4	0	1	6	3	3.29	1381/1554	3.90	4.08	4.10	4.01	3.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	1	5	7	4.00	1233/1488	4.24	4.35	4.47	4.41	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	1029/1493	4.62	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	2	2	9	4.06	1081/1486	4.22	4.30	4.32	4.26	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	2	8	3.81	1231/1489	4.05	4.24	4.32	4.22	3.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	2	6	1	4	3.20	1119/1277	3.37	3.63	4.03	3.91	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	4	3	4	3.54	1051/1279	3.94	4.22	4.17	3.96	3.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	928/1270	4.23	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	0	1	5	5	3.85	1007/1269	4.29	4.48	4.35	4.09	3.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	464/ 878	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.91	4.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 379	3.77	3.85	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.24	3.25	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.19	3.07	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	3.50	4.25	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	3.75	4.38	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	1	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.19	3.22	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 17	Non-major 17
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 responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 6		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0701  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: TAYLOR, PAUL  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 711  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	8	2	4	3.29	1500/1576	3.79	4.12	4.30	4.11	3.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	7	4.06	1107/1576	4.16	4.22	4.27	4.18	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	931/1342	4.11	4.32	4.32	4.19	4.12	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	929/1520	4.12	4.32	4.25	4.09	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	7	4	3.82	1051/1465	3.89	4.16	4.12	4.02	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	7	5	3.94	953/1434	4.06	4.31	4.14	3.94	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	2	4	7	3.76	1235/1547	3.97	4.07	4.19	4.10	3.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	625/1574	4.51	4.43	4.64	4.59	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	3	6	5	3.93	1019/1554	3.90	4.08	4.10	4.01	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	2	2	7	4	3.53	1385/1488	4.24	4.35	4.47	4.41	3.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	5	10	4.35	1311/1493	4.62	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	3	7	5	3.94	1168/1486	4.22	4.30	4.32	4.26	3.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	6	4	5	3.59	1301/1489	4.05	4.24	4.32	4.22	3.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	0	5	3	2	3.45	1043/1277	3.37	3.63	4.03	3.91	3.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	2	4	5	3.71	981/1279	3.94	4.22	4.17	3.96	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	845/1270	4.23	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.21	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	840/1269	4.29	4.48	4.35	4.09	4.21	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	625/ 878	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.91	3.77	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	3.83	3.83	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 240	3.20	3.20	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 229	4.00	4.00	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 232	3.50	3.50	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	229/ 379	3.77	3.85	4.20	4.15	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 85	3.50	4.58	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 79	4.00	4.67	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 72	3.00	4.13	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 80	3.75	4.43	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.24	3.25	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	4.00	4.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 48	3.50	3.50	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	3.50	3.50	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 45	3.75	3.75	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	7	1	0	3.13	242/ 326	3.19	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.13	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 40	3.75	4.38	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	3.50	4.25	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	3.50	4.25	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 28	3.75	4.38	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.19	3.22	4.08	3.86	3.00	

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0701  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: TAYLOR, PAUL  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 711  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 4	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 17 Non-major 17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 0		



Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0801  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 712  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	727/1576	3.79	4.12	4.30	4.11	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	542/1576	4.16	4.22	4.27	4.18	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	406/1342	4.11	4.32	4.32	4.19	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	511/1520	4.12	4.32	4.25	4.09	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	304/1465	3.89	4.16	4.12	4.02	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	524/1434	4.06	4.31	4.14	3.94	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	4	12	4.30	784/1547	3.97	4.07	4.19	4.10	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	17	2	4.11	1424/1574	4.51	4.43	4.64	4.59	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	449/1554	3.90	4.08	4.10	4.01	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	624/1488	4.24	4.35	4.47	4.41	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	557/1493	4.62	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	514/1486	4.22	4.30	4.32	4.26	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	856/1489	4.05	4.24	4.32	4.22	4.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	3	1	3	4	2	3.08	1144/1277	3.37	3.63	4.03	3.91	3.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	783/1279	3.94	4.22	4.17	3.96	4.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	3	1	12	4.56	589/1270	4.23	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	444/1269	4.29	4.48	4.35	4.09	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	2	4	0	3	3	3.08	795/ 878	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.91	3.08	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	3.83	3.83	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	3.20	3.20	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	4.00	4.00	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	3.50	3.50	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	14	1	4.07	216/ 379	3.77	3.85	4.20	4.15	4.07	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	3.50	4.58	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	4.00	4.67	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	3.00	4.13	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	3.75	4.43	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	6	0	1	3.29	240/ 375	3.24	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.29	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	4.00	4.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	3.50	3.50	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	3.50	3.50	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	3.75	3.75	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	5	0	2	3.57	177/ 326	3.19	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.57	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	3.75	4.38	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	3.50	4.25	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	3.50	4.25	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	3.75	4.38	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 382	3.19	3.22	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0801  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 712  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0901  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 713  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	5	5	2	3.19	1512/1576	3.79	4.12	4.30	4.11	3.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	5	5	3.63	1360/1576	4.16	4.22	4.27	4.18	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1209/1342	4.11	4.32	4.32	4.19	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	0	4	3	6	3.73	1266/1520	4.12	4.32	4.25	4.09	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	3	6	2	3.20	1347/1465	3.89	4.16	4.12	4.02	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	5	4	4	3.53	1194/1434	4.06	4.31	4.14	3.94	3.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	1	4	3	4	3.62	1298/1547	3.97	4.07	4.19	4.10	3.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	1079/1574	4.51	4.43	4.64	4.59	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	1	0	5	2	1	3.22	1399/1554	3.90	4.08	4.10	4.01	3.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	3	5	5	3.69	1365/1488	4.24	4.35	4.47	4.41	3.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	1301/1493	4.62	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	4	5	5	3.69	1279/1486	4.22	4.30	4.32	4.26	3.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	5	6	2	3.25	1381/1489	4.05	4.24	4.32	4.22	3.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	4	5	2	2	2.87	1197/1277	3.37	3.63	4.03	3.91	2.87	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	2	3	1	3	3.30	1139/1279	3.94	4.22	4.17	3.96	3.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	2	2	1	4	3.50	1135/1270	4.23	4.49	4.35	4.09	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	3	0	5	3.70	1055/1269	4.29	4.48	4.35	4.09	3.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	415/ 878	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.91	4.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 234	3.83	3.83	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 240	3.20	3.20	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 229	4.00	4.00	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 232	3.50	3.50	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	10	0	3.91	325/ 379	3.77	3.85	4.20	4.15	3.91	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	3.50	4.58	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	4.00	4.67	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	3.00	4.13	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	3.75	4.43	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	8	1	0	3.11	279/ 375	3.24	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.11	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	4.00	4.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	3.50	3.50	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	3.50	3.50	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	3.75	3.75	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.19	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	3.75	4.38	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	3.50	4.25	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	3.50	4.25	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	3.75	4.38	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.19	3.22	4.08	3.86	3.00	

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0901  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 713  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 1001  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: RAY, JENNIE  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 714  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	13	6	4.00	1148/1576	3.79	4.12	4.30	4.11	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	502/1576	4.16	4.22	4.27	4.18	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	1	3	4	9	4.06	955/1342	4.11	4.32	4.32	4.19	4.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	13	4.38	719/1520	4.12	4.32	4.25	4.09	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	5	5	9	3.86	1020/1465	3.89	4.16	4.12	4.02	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	8	13	4.39	534/1434	4.06	4.31	4.14	3.94	4.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	7	13	4.45	608/1547	3.97	4.07	4.19	4.10	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	2	20	4.74	795/1574	4.51	4.43	4.64	4.59	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	13	8	4.32	649/1554	3.90	4.08	4.10	4.01	4.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	970/1488	4.24	4.35	4.47	4.41	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	582/1493	4.62	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	792/1486	4.22	4.30	4.32	4.26	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	9	7	4.16	1027/1489	4.05	4.24	4.32	4.22	4.16	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	1	1	5	5	4	3.63	963/1277	3.37	3.63	4.03	3.91	3.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	532/1279	3.94	4.22	4.17	3.96	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	2	2	2	8	4.14	881/1270	4.23	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	644/1269	4.29	4.48	4.35	4.09	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	1	7	3	2	3.46	722/ 878	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.91	3.46	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	2	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 234	3.83	3.83	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 240	3.20	3.20	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 229	4.00	4.00	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 232	3.50	3.50	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	1	1	13	1	3.88	332/ 379	3.77	3.85	4.20	4.15	3.88	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 85	3.50	4.58	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 79	4.00	4.67	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 72	3.00	4.13	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 80	3.75	4.43	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	17	3	0	3.15	268/ 375	3.24	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.15	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 52	4.00	4.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 48	3.50	3.50	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 44	3.50	3.50	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	3.75	3.75	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	1	0	14	1	1	3.06	249/ 326	3.19	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.06	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 40	3.75	4.38	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	3.50	4.25	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 35	3.50	4.25	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 28	3.75	4.38	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	13	0	2	3.27	266/ 382	3.19	3.22	4.08	3.86	3.27	

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 1001  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: RAY, JENNIE  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 714  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	3	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0101  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 715  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	5	3	3.75	1345/1576	3.75	4.12	4.30	4.11	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	4	1	3.00	1523/1576	3.00	4.22	4.27	4.18	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	1294/1342	3.00	4.32	4.32	4.19	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	3	2	3	3.50	1362/1520	3.50	4.32	4.25	4.09	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	4	1	3.08	1372/1465	3.08	4.16	4.12	4.02	3.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	6	2	3.58	1178/1434	3.58	4.31	4.14	3.94	3.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	2	5	1	0	2.36	1524/1547	2.36	4.07	4.19	4.10	2.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	606/1574	4.83	4.43	4.64	4.59	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	3	1	1	3	0	2.50	1524/1554	3.15	4.08	4.10	4.01	3.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	3	2	2	3.33	1418/1488	4.00	4.35	4.47	4.41	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1255/1493	4.51	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1386/1486	3.73	4.30	4.32	4.26	3.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	6	2	1	3.44	1332/1489	3.81	4.24	4.32	4.22	3.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	3	0	3	4	0	2.80	1203/1277	3.40	3.63	4.03	3.91	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	5	1	3.45	1085/1279	3.45	4.22	4.17	3.96	3.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	860/1270	4.18	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	858/1269	4.18	4.48	4.35	4.09	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	648/ 878	3.73	4.02	4.05	3.91	3.73	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 234	****	3.83	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	3.20	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 229	****	4.00	4.51	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	3.85	4.20	4.15	4.00	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	4.13	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.43	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	7	0	1	3.25	245/ 375	3.25	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.50	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	3.50	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	3.75	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.38	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	4.25	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.25	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	4.38	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	1	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.22	4.08	3.86	3.00	

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0101  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 715  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	5	3	3.75	1345/1576	3.75	4.12	4.30	4.11	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	4	1	3.00	1523/1576	3.00	4.22	4.27	4.18	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	1294/1342	3.00	4.32	4.32	4.19	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	3	2	3	3.50	1362/1520	3.50	4.32	4.25	4.09	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	4	1	3.08	1372/1465	3.08	4.16	4.12	4.02	3.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	6	2	3.58	1178/1434	3.58	4.31	4.14	3.94	3.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	2	5	1	0	2.36	1524/1547	2.36	4.07	4.19	4.10	2.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	606/1574	4.83	4.43	4.64	4.59	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1132/1554	3.15	4.08	4.10	4.01	3.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	666/1488	4.00	4.35	4.47	4.41	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1150/1493	4.51	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1003/1486	3.73	4.30	4.32	4.26	3.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1020/1489	3.81	4.24	4.32	4.22	3.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	692/1277	3.40	3.63	4.03	3.91	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	5	1	3.45	1085/1279	3.45	4.22	4.17	3.96	3.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	860/1270	4.18	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	858/1269	4.18	4.48	4.35	4.09	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	648/ 878	3.73	4.02	4.05	3.91	3.73	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 234	****	3.83	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	3.20	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 229	****	4.00	4.51	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	3.85	4.20	4.15	4.00	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	4.13	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.43	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	7	0	1	3.25	245/ 375	3.25	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.50	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	3.50	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	3.75	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.38	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	4.25	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.25	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	4.38	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	1	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.22	4.08	3.86	3.00	

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0101

Title COMPOSITION

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 22

Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 716

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 110 0101  
 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN  
 Instructor: SIMS, DIANA  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 717  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	7	6	4	2	9	3.00	1539/1576	3.00	4.12	4.30	4.11	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	4	4	2	12	3.36	1456/1576	3.36	4.22	4.27	4.18	3.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	2	2	2	8	3.75	1132/1342	3.75	4.32	4.32	4.19	3.75		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	7	3	3	4	7	3.04	1464/1520	3.04	4.32	4.25	4.09	3.04	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	3	4	3	11	3.37	1302/1465	3.37	4.16	4.12	4.02	3.37	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	9	2	3	3	11	3.18	1335/1434	3.18	4.31	4.14	3.94	3.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	6	3	2	4	12	3.48	1353/1547	3.48	4.07	4.19	4.10	3.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	16	3	4	3	2	2.00	1573/1574	2.00	4.43	4.64	4.59	2.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	5	0	2	3	5	3.20	1405/1554	3.20	4.08	4.10	4.01	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	4	4	5	2	13	3.57	1380/1488	3.57	4.35	4.47	4.41	3.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	3	2	5	3	15	3.89	1441/1493	3.89	4.72	4.73	4.65	3.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	9	3	2	12	3.46	1342/1486	3.46	4.30	4.32	4.26	3.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	10	5	0	1	12	3.00	1415/1489	3.00	4.24	4.32	4.22	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	4	3	6	2	10	3.44	1047/1277	3.44	3.63	4.03	3.91	3.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	6	6	1	3	6	2.86	1219/1279	2.86	4.22	4.17	3.96	2.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	8	5	3	5	3.14	1196/1270	3.14	4.49	4.35	4.09	3.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	6	1	4	8	3.36	1154/1269	3.36	4.48	4.35	4.09	3.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	7	6	3	1	3	3	2.63	845/ 878	2.63	4.02	4.05	3.91	2.63	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	3	0	0	1	1	2.40	****/ 234	****	3.83	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	2	1	0	1	2.60	****/ 240	****	3.20	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 229	****	4.00	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	****/ 232	****	3.50	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	2	0	0	1	18	1	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	3.85	4.20	4.15	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	****	4.58	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 72	****	4.13	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 80	****	4.43	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	1	1	14	1	1	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.50	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 44	****	3.50	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 45	****	3.75	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	2	0	11	0	1	2.86	324/ 326	2.86	3.07	4.03	3.64	2.86	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 40	****	4.38	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 24	****	4.25	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 35	****	4.25	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 28	****	4.38	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	1	0	7	0	2	3.20	281/ 382	3.20	3.22	4.08	3.86	3.20	

Course-Section: ENGL 110 0101  
 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN  
 Instructor: SIMS, DIANA  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 717  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 210 0101  
 Title INTRODUCTION TO LIT  
 Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA  
 Enrollment: 48  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 718  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	3	7	9	6	3.43	1474/1576	3.89	4.12	4.30	4.35	3.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	7	13	4.04	1119/1576	4.30	4.22	4.27	4.32	4.04	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	5	8	11	4.04	961/1342	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.41	4.04	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	4	10	12	4.19	929/1520	4.39	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	18	4.48	395/1465	4.49	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	6	14	5	3.78	1081/1434	4.09	4.31	4.14	4.06	3.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	5	11	8	4.00	1041/1547	4.26	4.07	4.19	4.22	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	2	24	4.85	567/1574	4.47	4.43	4.64	4.62	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	6	12	5	3.88	1081/1554	4.20	4.08	4.10	4.05	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	11	15	4.52	858/1488	4.60	4.35	4.47	4.44	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	24	4.85	683/1493	4.85	4.72	4.73	4.75	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	10	12	4.26	959/1486	4.49	4.30	4.32	4.29	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	6	16	4.37	845/1489	4.51	4.24	4.32	4.31	4.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	2	0	5	7	4	3.61	968/1277	4.05	3.63	4.03	4.01	3.61	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.22	4.17	4.14	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	3	3	14	4.55	597/1270	4.55	4.49	4.35	4.30	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	694/1269	4.45	4.48	4.35	4.29	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	9	2	2	3	3	1	2.91	826/ 878	2.91	4.02	4.05	3.92	2.91	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	5	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 210 0201  
 Title INTRODUCTION TO LIT  
 Instructor: ROCKETT, DANIKA  
 Enrollment: 54  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 719  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	16	15	4.35	840/1576	3.89	4.12	4.30	4.35	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	13	20	4.56	542/1576	4.30	4.22	4.27	4.32	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	23	4.59	500/1342	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.41	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	24	4.59	418/1520	4.39	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	10	19	4.50	366/1465	4.49	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	12	17	4.39	534/1434	4.09	4.31	4.14	4.06	4.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	4	25	4.53	503/1547	4.26	4.07	4.19	4.22	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	5	21	8	4.09	1431/1574	4.47	4.43	4.64	4.62	4.09	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	2	9	16	4.52	387/1554	4.20	4.08	4.10	4.05	4.52	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	8	23	4.69	638/1488	4.60	4.35	4.47	4.44	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	27	4.84	734/1493	4.85	4.72	4.73	4.75	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	7	24	4.72	393/1486	4.49	4.30	4.32	4.29	4.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	8	23	4.66	513/1489	4.51	4.24	4.32	4.31	4.66	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	2	2	6	21	4.48	328/1277	4.05	3.63	4.03	4.01	4.48	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/1279	4.50	4.22	4.17	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1270	4.55	4.49	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1269	4.45	4.48	4.35	4.29	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	28	2	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 878	2.91	4.02	4.05	3.92	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 379	****	3.85	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.21	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 27	Required for Majors	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 2		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0	Electives	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		
			P 1		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	17

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

Course-Section: ENGL 226 0101  
 Title ENGLISH GRAMMAR USAGE  
 Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 720  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	5	6	6	6	3.36	1489/1576	3.36	4.12	4.30	4.35	3.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	6	12	4.16	1023/1576	4.16	4.22	4.27	4.32	4.16	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	2	5	14	4.41	709/1342	4.41	4.32	4.32	4.41	4.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	8	5	8	3.83	1218/1520	3.83	4.32	4.25	4.26	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	6	6	1	6	3.05	1379/1465	3.05	4.16	4.12	4.09	3.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	8	7	6	3.52	1197/1434	3.52	4.31	4.14	4.06	3.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	4	5	12	4.08	985/1547	4.08	4.07	4.19	4.22	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	2	3	13	6	0	2.96	1568/1574	2.96	4.43	4.64	4.62	2.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	9	6	4	3.57	1277/1554	3.57	4.08	4.10	4.05	3.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	2	6	10	5	3.56	1381/1488	3.56	4.35	4.47	4.44	3.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	5	8	11	4.12	1395/1493	4.12	4.72	4.73	4.75	4.12	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	10	6	8	3.80	1233/1486	3.80	4.30	4.32	4.29	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	11	7	3.88	1200/1489	3.88	4.24	4.32	4.31	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	2	0	4	2	3	3.36	1077/1277	3.36	3.63	4.03	4.01	3.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	2	1	4	2	3.40	1106/1279	3.40	4.22	4.17	4.14	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	1054/1270	3.75	4.49	4.35	4.30	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	1029/1269	3.78	4.48	4.35	4.29	3.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.02	4.05	3.92	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.21	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	21
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	2	C	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
			Required for Majors	8	Graduate
			General	2	Under-grad
			Electives	2	Non-major
			Other	8	23

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

Course-Section: ENGL 231 0101  
 Title INTRO WORLD LIT. I  
 Instructor: FALCO, RAPHAEL  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 721  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	429/1576	4.65	4.12	4.30	4.35	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	653/1576	4.48	4.22	4.27	4.32	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	11	10	4.30	797/1342	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.41	4.30		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	281/1520	4.73	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	187/1465	4.78	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	13	4.43	486/1434	4.43	4.31	4.14	4.06	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	8	10	4.13	947/1547	4.13	4.07	4.19	4.22	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	8	4.35	1253/1574	4.35	4.43	4.64	4.62	4.35	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.08	4.10	4.05	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	846/1488	4.52	4.35	4.47	4.44	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	557/1493	4.91	4.72	4.73	4.75	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.30	4.32	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	297/1489	4.82	4.24	4.32	4.31	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	1	0	2	0	6	4.11	645/1277	4.11	3.63	4.03	4.01	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	3	13	4.47	477/1279	4.47	4.22	4.17	4.14	4.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	0	3	13	4.44	696/1270	4.44	4.49	4.35	4.30	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	467/1269	4.74	4.48	4.35	4.29	4.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	9	1	1	2	4	1	3.33	755/ 878	3.33	4.02	4.05	3.92	3.33	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.20	4.35	4.47	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.48	4.74	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.50	4.40	4.71	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	3.50	4.73	4.69	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.75	4.57	4.64	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.38	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.25	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 13			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 5	Under-grad 23	Non-major 19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 6		
				? 0			



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	11	4	16	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.12	4.30	4.35	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	9	18	4.41	759/1576	4.41	4.22	4.27	4.32	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	22	4.52	572/1342	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.41	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	5	23	4.55	464/1520	4.55	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	28	4.82	169/1465	4.82	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	7	10	16	4.27	659/1434	4.27	4.31	4.14	4.06	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	4	8	19	4.38	718/1547	4.38	4.07	4.19	4.22	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	22	9	4.21	1353/1574	4.21	4.43	4.64	4.62	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	12	12	4.38	558/1554	4.38	4.08	4.10	4.05	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	3	8	21	4.45	932/1488	4.45	4.35	4.47	4.44	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	223/1493	4.97	4.72	4.73	4.75	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	10	19	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.30	4.32	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	9	20	4.48	719/1489	4.48	4.24	4.32	4.31	4.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	8	5	12	4.16	608/1277	4.16	3.63	4.03	4.01	4.16	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	2	1	8	9	4.20	712/1279	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.14	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	1	1	17	4.70	478/1270	4.70	4.49	4.35	4.30	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	0	1	18	4.80	386/1269	4.80	4.48	4.35	4.29	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	344/ 878	4.29	4.02	4.05	3.92	4.29	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	3.20	4.35	4.47	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.43	4.61	4.80	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.48	4.74	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	3.50	4.40	4.71	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.38	4.60	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.25	4.67	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 21	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0	Major 6
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	General 10	Under-grad 33	Non-major 27
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 2			
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0			
				P 0			
				I 0			
				? 0			

Course-Section: ENGL 243 0101  
 Title CURRENTS IN AMERICAN L  
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 723  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	9	10	4.27	928/1576	4.27	4.12	4.30	4.35	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	11	6	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.22	4.27	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	5	10	4.14	912/1342	4.14	4.32	4.32	4.41	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	707/1520	4.38	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	206/1465	4.75	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	524/1434	4.40	4.31	4.14	4.06	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	3	16	4.62	399/1547	4.62	4.07	4.19	4.22	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	281/1574	4.95	4.43	4.64	4.62	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	2	10	6	4.22	742/1554	4.22	4.08	4.10	4.05	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	11	10	4.41	995/1488	4.41	4.35	4.47	4.44	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	557/1493	4.91	4.72	4.73	4.75	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	9	12	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.30	4.32	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	539/1489	4.64	4.24	4.32	4.31	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	1	3	7	7	3.80	856/1277	3.80	3.63	4.03	4.01	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	406/1279	4.56	4.22	4.17	4.14	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	541/1270	4.63	4.49	4.35	4.30	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	1	13	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.48	4.35	4.29	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	0	0	7	7	4.27	361/ 878	4.27	4.02	4.05	3.92	4.27	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	3.83	4.23	4.44	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	3.20	4.35	4.47	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	22	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 250 0101  
 Title INTRO TO SHAKESPEARE  
 Instructor: OSHEROW, MICHEL  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 724  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	8	21	4.72	335/1576	4.72	4.12	4.30	4.35	4.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	17	4.45	698/1576	4.45	4.22	4.27	4.32	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	22	4.69	381/1342	4.69	4.32	4.32	4.41	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	17	4.45	614/1520	4.45	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	143/1465	4.86	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	10	16	4.41	511/1434	4.41	4.31	4.14	4.06	4.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	9	17	4.45	624/1547	4.45	4.07	4.19	4.22	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	14	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.43	4.64	4.62	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	272/1554	4.65	4.08	4.10	4.05	4.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	21	4.71	589/1488	4.71	4.35	4.47	4.44	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	298/1486	4.79	4.30	4.32	4.29	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	286/1489	4.82	4.24	4.32	4.31	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	17	2	1	4	1	2	3.00	1149/1277	3.00	3.63	4.03	4.01	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	4	15	4.65	343/1279	4.65	4.22	4.17	4.14	4.65	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	260/1270	4.90	4.49	4.35	4.30	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	386/1269	4.80	4.48	4.35	4.29	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	1	6	5	8	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.02	4.05	3.92	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	29	Non-major	13
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 271 0101  
 Title INTRO CREAT WRTG-FICTI  
 Instructor: SAWYERS, SETH A  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 725  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	595/1576	4.36	4.12	4.30	4.35	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	462/1576	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.32	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	0	4	4	4.60	480/1342	4.60	4.32	4.32	4.41	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	339/1520	4.49	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	3	6	3.77	1095/1465	3.53	4.16	4.12	4.09	3.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	11	4.69	243/1434	4.49	4.31	4.14	4.06	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	1	1	5	3	3.50	1347/1547	3.69	4.07	4.19	4.22	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1574	4.97	4.43	4.64	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	692/1554	4.20	4.08	4.10	4.05	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	0	7	4.40	995/1488	4.20	4.35	4.47	4.44	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1493	4.95	4.72	4.73	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	678/1486	4.25	4.30	4.32	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	921/1489	4.21	4.24	4.32	4.31	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	3.63	4.03	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	262/1279	4.80	4.22	4.17	4.14	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1270	4.85	4.49	4.35	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1269	4.96	4.48	4.35	4.29	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 878	4.44	4.02	4.05	3.92	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 271 0201  
 Title INTRO CREAT WR TG-FICTI  
 Instructor: BLOOM, RYAN I.  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 726  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	1035/1576	4.36	4.12	4.30	4.35	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	6	6	4.06	1107/1576	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.32	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1342	4.60	4.32	4.32	4.41	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	792/1520	4.49	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	4	7	2	3.29	1329/1465	3.53	4.16	4.12	4.09	3.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	2	11	4.29	636/1434	4.49	4.31	4.14	4.06	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	3	3	7	3.88	1167/1547	3.69	4.07	4.19	4.22	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	281/1574	4.97	4.43	4.64	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	12	3	4.13	849/1554	4.20	4.08	4.10	4.05	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1233/1488	4.20	4.35	4.47	4.44	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	557/1493	4.95	4.72	4.73	4.75	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1101/1486	4.25	4.30	4.32	4.29	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1057/1489	4.21	4.24	4.32	4.31	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	7	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1277	****	3.63	4.03	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	199/1279	4.80	4.22	4.17	4.14	4.85	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	478/1270	4.85	4.49	4.35	4.30	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	222/1269	4.96	4.48	4.35	4.29	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	570/ 878	4.44	4.02	4.05	3.92	3.88	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	17	Non-major	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENGL 273 0101  
 Title INT CREATIVE WTG-POETR  
 Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 727  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	457/1576	4.64	4.12	4.30	4.35	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	2	4	3.82	1286/1576	3.82	4.22	4.27	4.32	3.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1342	****	4.32	4.32	4.41	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	837/1520	4.27	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	0	7	4.09	803/1465	4.09	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	368/1434	4.55	4.31	4.14	4.06	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	1	3	3.18	1427/1547	3.18	4.07	4.19	4.22	3.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	5	3	1	3.56	1553/1574	3.56	4.43	4.64	4.62	3.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.08	4.10	4.05	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	995/1488	4.40	4.35	4.47	4.44	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	1125/1493	4.60	4.72	4.73	4.75	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	561/1486	4.60	4.30	4.32	4.29	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	813/1489	4.40	4.24	4.32	4.31	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1277	****	3.63	4.03	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.22	4.17	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.49	4.35	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	819/1269	4.25	4.48	4.35	4.29	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.02	4.05	3.92	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	3.85	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.25	4.01	4.21	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.39	****	

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	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	11	Non-major	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 291 0201  
 Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY  
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 728  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	98/1576	4.78	4.12	4.30	4.35	4.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	406/1576	4.32	4.22	4.27	4.32	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	197/1342	4.88	4.32	4.32	4.41	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	249/1520	4.88	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	304/1465	3.97	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	114/1434	4.91	4.31	4.14	4.06	4.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	351/1547	4.03	4.07	4.19	4.22	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	567/1574	4.89	4.43	4.64	4.62	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	10	9	4.47	436/1554	4.32	4.08	4.10	4.05	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	638/1488	4.03	4.35	4.47	4.44	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	339/1486	4.25	4.30	4.32	4.29	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	297/1489	4.32	4.24	4.32	4.31	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	780/1277	3.60	3.63	4.03	4.01	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	236/1279	4.84	4.22	4.17	4.14	4.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	208/1270	4.96	4.49	4.35	4.30	4.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	222/1269	4.96	4.48	4.35	4.29	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	276/ 878	4.51	4.02	4.05	3.92	4.42	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 291 0301  
 Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY  
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 729  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	485/1576	4.78	4.12	4.30	4.35	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	1138/1576	4.32	4.22	4.27	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	4.88	4.32	4.32	4.41	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1520	4.88	4.32	4.25	4.26	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	3	1	4	3.33	1317/1465	3.97	4.16	4.12	4.09	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	88/1434	4.91	4.31	4.14	4.06	4.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	6	1	3	3.42	1376/1547	4.03	4.07	4.19	4.22	3.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	375/1574	4.89	4.43	4.64	4.62	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	805/1554	4.32	4.08	4.10	4.05	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	5	1	3	3.36	1413/1488	4.03	4.35	4.47	4.44	3.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	1253/1486	4.25	4.30	4.32	4.29	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	5	4	3.83	1222/1489	4.32	4.24	4.32	4.31	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1099/1277	3.60	3.63	4.03	4.01	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	169/1279	4.84	4.22	4.17	4.14	4.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1270	4.96	4.49	4.35	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1269	4.96	4.48	4.35	4.29	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	187/ 878	4.51	4.02	4.05	3.92	4.60	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	3.20	4.35	4.47	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	3.85	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.72	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.13	4.64	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.43	4.61	4.80	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.48	4.74	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	3.50	4.40	4.71	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	3.50	4.73	4.69	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.75	4.57	4.64	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.38	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.25	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.25	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.38	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.39	****	



Course-Section: ENGL 291 0301  
 Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY  
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 729  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 300 0101  
 Title COMM/TECH - ANALYSIS  
 Instructor: BURGESS, HELEN  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 730  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	2	11	4.28	928/1576	4.28	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	191/1342	4.89	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	339/1520	4.67	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	264/1465	4.67	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	1219/1574	4.39	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.39	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	208/1554	4.73	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	463/1488	4.78	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	311/1486	4.78	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	3	4	7	3.94	769/1277	3.94	3.63	4.03	4.11	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	488/1279	4.47	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	487/1270	4.69	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	310/1269	4.88	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	245/ 878	4.46	4.02	4.05	4.09	4.46	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	3.85	4.20	4.17	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.24	****	

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	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	18	Non-major	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENGL 301 0101  
 Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG  
 Instructor: MCKINLEY, KATHE  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 731  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	2	7	2	3	3.13	1524/1576	3.61	4.12	4.30	4.30	3.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	3	5	3	3	3.13	1511/1576	3.56	4.22	4.27	4.28	3.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	5	2	6	3.53	1204/1342	3.59	4.32	4.32	4.30	3.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	1	6	4	3	3.31	1424/1520	3.76	4.32	4.25	4.25	3.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	6	6	3.94	933/1465	4.20	4.16	4.12	4.09	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	2	5	2	4	3.13	1353/1434	3.71	4.31	4.14	4.15	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	7	5	2	3.29	1405/1547	3.70	4.07	4.19	4.21	3.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	11	5	4.24	1339/1574	4.22	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	4	0	6	6	1	3.00	1448/1554	3.50	4.08	4.10	4.09	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	1	2	3	7	3.80	1343/1488	4.18	4.35	4.47	4.47	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	0	4	9	4.33	1321/1493	4.57	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	1	7	4	3.73	1261/1486	3.92	4.30	4.32	4.32	3.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	3	6	3	3.47	1325/1489	3.83	4.24	4.32	4.34	3.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	13	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1277	****	3.63	4.03	4.11	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	1	5	1	3	3.00	1186/1279	3.58	4.22	4.17	4.20	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	5	1	6	3.92	990/1270	3.99	4.49	4.35	4.42	3.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	2	3	1	5	3.38	1148/1269	3.80	4.48	4.35	4.41	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	776/ 878	3.53	4.02	4.05	4.09	3.22	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	3.83	4.23	4.24	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	3.85	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.24	****	

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	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 301 0201  
 Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG  
 Instructor: MCKINLEY, KATHE  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 732  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	8	8	4.10	1089/1576	3.61	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	8	7	4.00	1138/1576	3.56	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	6	6	3.65	1169/1342	3.59	4.32	4.32	4.30	3.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	9	7	4.21	902/1520	3.76	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	2	15	4.45	454/1465	4.20	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	6	11	4.30	625/1434	3.71	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	3	11	4.10	971/1547	3.70	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	4	4.20	1367/1574	4.22	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	3	9	6	4.00	924/1554	3.50	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	810/1488	4.18	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	810/1493	4.57	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	4	6	9	4.10	1069/1486	3.92	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.10	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	2	12	4.20	997/1489	3.83	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	18	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1277	****	3.63	4.03	4.11	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	732/1279	3.58	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	2	1	5	9	4.06	915/1270	3.99	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.06	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	2	1	6	9	4.22	835/1269	3.80	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	584/ 878	3.53	4.02	4.05	4.09	3.85	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	7
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 303 0101  
 Title ART OF THE ESSAY  
 Instructor: FARABAUGH, ROBI  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 733  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	2	13	4.47	682/1576	4.47	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	10	4.37	811/1576	4.37	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.37	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1342	****	4.32	4.32	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	281/1520	4.72	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	571/1465	4.33	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	176/1434	4.78	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	3	9	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	281/1574	4.95	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	307/1554	4.61	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	589/1488	4.71	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	683/1493	4.86	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	596/1486	4.57	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	13	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1277	****	3.63	4.03	4.11	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	262/1279	4.75	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	288/1270	4.88	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	444/1269	4.75	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	10	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	742/ 878	3.40	4.02	4.05	4.09	3.40	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 304 0101  
 Title BRIT LIT:MEDIEVAL/RENA  
 Instructor: FALCO, RAPHAEL  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 734  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	387/1576	4.68	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	364/1576	4.68	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	381/1342	4.68	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	562/1520	4.47	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	127/1465	4.89	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	4	11	4.26	827/1547	4.26	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	1	4.05	1441/1574	4.05	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.05	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	6	9	4.38	571/1554	4.38	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	1064/1488	4.32	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	1	14	4.53	654/1486	4.53	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	16	4.68	474/1489	4.68	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	1260/1277	2.20	3.63	4.03	4.11	2.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	3	13	4.59	393/1279	4.59	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.59	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	574/1270	4.59	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.59	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	596/1269	4.59	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.59	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	16	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.02	4.05	4.09	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	7
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 305 0101  
 Title BRIT LIT:RESTOR - ROMA  
 Instructor: DONOVAN, JULIE  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 735  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	6	16	4.44	727/1576	4.44	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	16	4.54	555/1576	4.54	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	10	12	4.36	744/1342	4.36	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	15	4.52	487/1520	4.52	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.52	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	6	18	4.64	277/1465	4.64	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	11	11	4.28	647/1434	4.28	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.28	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	363/1547	4.64	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	17	7	4.29	1295/1574	4.29	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	3	11	6	4.15	816/1554	4.15	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	5	16	4.46	932/1488	4.46	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	501/1493	4.91	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	6	13	4.33	891/1486	4.33	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	7	12	4.25	955/1489	4.25	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	2	0	6	3	7	3.72	909/1277	3.72	3.63	4.03	4.11	3.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	8	11	4.32	617/1279	4.32	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.32	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	389/1270	4.77	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	321/1269	4.86	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	1	3	7	9	4.05	456/ 878	4.05	4.02	4.05	4.09	4.05	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 306 0101  
 Title BRIT LIT: VICTORIAN-MO  
 Instructor: FERNANDEZ, JEAN  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 736  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	6	7	3.94	1203/1576	3.94	4.12	4.30	4.30	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	8	4.11	1067/1576	4.11	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	658/1342	4.44	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	837/1520	4.28	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	264/1465	4.67	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	594/1434	4.33	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	5	4	6	3.67	1276/1547	3.67	4.07	4.19	4.21	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.43	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	5	7	4	3.82	1117/1554	3.82	4.08	4.10	4.09	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	5	4	7	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	1077/1493	4.65	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	1017/1486	4.18	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	801/1489	4.41	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	3.63	4.03	4.11	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	681/1279	4.23	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.23	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	749/1270	4.38	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	793/1269	4.31	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	11	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 878	****	4.02	4.05	4.09	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.12	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 0		



Course-Section: ENGL 307 0101  
 Title AM LIT TO CIVIL WAR  
 Instructor: STEWART, CAROLE  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 737  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	7	10	4.29	916/1576	4.29	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	12	9	4.43	728/1576	4.43	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	510/1342	4.57	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	11	4.48	562/1520	4.48	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.48	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	200/1465	4.76	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	5	10	4.10	840/1434	4.10	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	2	15	4.48	575/1547	4.48	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	1003/1574	4.60	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	9	6	4.17	805/1554	4.17	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	736/1488	4.62	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	3	16	4.62	1113/1493	4.62	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	7	11	4.29	936/1486	4.29	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	672/1489	4.52	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	3	1	3	4	3.73	909/1277	3.73	3.63	4.03	4.11	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	741/1269	4.39	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.39	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	1	1	1	7	3	3.77	625/ 878	3.77	4.02	4.05	4.09	3.77	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0	
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	1	
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 21	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other		16
			? 3			

Course-Section: ENGL 308 0101  
 Title AM LIT AFTER CIVIL WAR  
 Instructor: GWIAZDA, PIOTR  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 738  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	7	14	4.55	582/1576	4.55	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	5	15	4.55	555/1576	4.55	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	15	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	562/1520	4.48	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.48	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	225/1465	4.73	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	323/1434	4.60	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	503/1547	4.52	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	469/1574	4.91	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	623/1554	4.33	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	638/1488	4.68	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	784/1493	4.82	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	514/1486	4.64	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	539/1489	4.64	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	3	7	4	4	3.37	1077/1277	3.37	3.63	4.03	4.11	3.37	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	400/1279	4.57	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	401/1270	4.76	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	432/1269	4.76	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.76	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	15	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	709/ 878	3.50	4.02	4.05	4.09	3.50	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 320 0101  
 Title TOPICS IN CT  
 Instructor: WEXLER, LAURA  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 739  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	697/1576	4.47	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	3	7	4.07	1100/1576	4.07	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	12	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1342	****	4.32	4.32	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	1012/1520	4.07	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	2	10	4.25	647/1465	4.25	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	1	11	4.44	486/1434	4.44	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	2	4	2	6	3.67	1276/1547	3.67	4.07	4.19	4.21	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	645/1574	4.81	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	732/1554	4.23	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	995/1488	4.40	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	557/1493	4.90	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	9	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1277	****	3.63	4.03	4.11	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	641/1279	4.29	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	378/1270	4.79	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	2	1	1	10	4.36	760/1269	4.36	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	631/ 878	3.75	4.02	4.05	4.09	3.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.58	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.43	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	6	Under-grad	17	Non-major	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 324 0101  
 Title THEORIES OF COMM TECH  
 Instructor: BURGESS, HELEN  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 740  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	7	12	4.43	757/1576	4.43	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	2	15	4.52	581/1576	4.52	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	562/1342	4.53	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	648/1520	4.42	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	353/1465	4.53	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	445/1547	4.58	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	14	5	4.26	1317/1574	4.26	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.26	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	339/1554	4.58	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	334/1493	4.95	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	422/1486	4.70	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	309/1489	4.80	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	1	1	0	1	5	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.63	4.03	4.11	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	335/1279	4.67	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	355/1270	4.80	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.48	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	4.02	4.05	4.09	4.33	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 326 0101  
 Title STRUCTURE OF ENGLISH  
 Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 741  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	541/1576	4.57	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	728/1576	4.43	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	209/1342	4.86	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	945/1520	4.17	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	748/1465	4.15	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	3	2	4	3.38	1270/1434	3.38	4.31	4.14	4.15	3.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	657/1547	4.43	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.43	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	2	8	2	3.77	1159/1554	3.77	4.08	4.10	4.09	3.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	324/1488	4.86	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	936/1486	4.29	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	434/1489	4.71	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	1260/1277	2.20	3.63	4.03	4.11	2.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	458/1270	4.71	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 878	****	4.02	4.05	4.09	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	14	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 340 0101  
 Title MAJOR LITERARY TRADITI  
 Instructor: BERMAN, JESSICA  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 742  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	201/1576	4.83	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.16	4.12	4.09	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	218/1434	4.73	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	434/1547	4.58	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	138/1554	4.86	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	557/1493	4.90	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	271/1486	4.80	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	309/1489	4.80	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1119/1277	3.20	3.63	4.03	4.11	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	413/1279	4.56	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	784/1270	4.33	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.48	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	****	4.02	4.05	4.09	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.58	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.13	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.43	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.23	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 6	Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Non-major 7
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 0
					Other 4

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

Course-Section: ENGL 350 0101  
 Title MAJ BRIT & AMER WRITER  
 Instructor: MCKINLEY, KATHE  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 743  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	840/1576	4.36	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	683/1342	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	961/1520	4.14	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	12	0	3.86	1529/1574	3.86	4.43	4.64	4.61	3.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	2	8	2	3.64	1240/1554	3.64	4.08	4.10	4.09	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	1087/1488	4.29	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	0	12	4.64	1077/1493	4.64	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	325/1486	4.77	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	526/1489	4.64	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1020/1277	3.50	3.63	4.03	4.11	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	774/1279	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	1	1	7	4.18	860/1270	4.18	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	2	1	3	4	3.64	1076/1269	3.64	4.48	4.35	4.41	3.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	791/ 878	3.13	4.02	4.05	4.09	3.13	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	3.85	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.58	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.13	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.43	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.12	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 351 0101  
 Title STUDIES IN SHAKESPEARE  
 Instructor: ORGELFINGER, GA  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 744  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	429/1576	4.65	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	476/1576	4.61	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	735/1342	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	13	4.35	756/1520	4.35	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	143/1465	4.87	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	218/1434	4.73	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	6	12	4.30	784/1547	4.30	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	9	4.39	1210/1574	4.39	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.39	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	1	4	13	4.47	436/1554	4.47	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	124/1488	4.95	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	86/1486	4.95	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	97/1489	4.95	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	2	3	3	8	3.88	812/1277	3.88	3.63	4.03	4.11	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	296/1279	4.71	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	355/1270	4.81	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	278/1269	4.90	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	2	0	2	10	6	3.90	557/ 878	3.90	4.02	4.05	4.09	3.90	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	18
			? 0		



Course-Section: ENGL 369 0101  
 Title RACE ETHNICITY US LIT  
 Instructor: STEWART, CAROLE  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 745  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	324/1576	4.74	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	301/1576	4.74	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1342	****	4.32	4.32	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	9	4.42	648/1520	4.42	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	153/1465	4.84	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.84	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	252/1434	4.68	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.68	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	207/1547	4.79	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	795/1574	4.74	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	149/1488	4.94	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	325/1486	4.76	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	364/1489	4.76	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	5	4	6	3.88	818/1277	3.88	3.63	4.03	4.11	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	365/1279	4.63	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	541/1270	4.63	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	444/1269	4.75	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	283/ 878	4.40	4.02	4.05	4.09	4.40	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	3.85	4.20	4.17	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		Non-major 10
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 2		
				Electives	2
				Other	8

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

Course-Section: ENGL 371 0101  
 Title CREATIVE WRITING-FICTI  
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 746  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	211/1576	4.85	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	194/1576	4.85	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	173/1520	4.85	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	297/1465	4.62	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	134/1434	4.85	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	167/1547	4.83	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.43	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	116/1554	4.91	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	385/1488	4.82	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	379/1486	4.73	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	420/1489	4.73	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.63	4.03	4.11	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.22	4.17	4.20	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.49	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	278/1269	4.91	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	152/ 878	4.70	4.02	4.05	4.09	4.70	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 373 0101  
 Title CREATIVE WRITING-POETR  
 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 747  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	4	0	3.33	1494/1576	3.33	4.12	4.30	4.30	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	594/1434	4.33	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	1500/1547	2.75	4.07	4.19	4.21	2.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1110/1554	3.83	4.08	4.10	4.09	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1406/1488	3.40	4.35	4.47	4.47	3.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1307/1486	3.60	4.30	4.32	4.32	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1298/1489	3.60	4.24	4.32	4.34	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1277	****	3.63	4.03	4.11	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	962/1279	3.75	4.22	4.17	4.20	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	819/1269	4.25	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	****	4.02	4.05	4.09	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	77/ 379	4.50	3.85	4.20	4.17	4.50
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	209/ 375	3.50	3.25	4.01	4.12	3.50
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.24	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 380 0101  
 Title INTRO TO NEWS WRITING  
 Instructor: WEISS, KENNETH  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 748  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	787/1576	4.40	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	668/1576	4.47	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	579/1520	4.47	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	647/1465	4.25	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	305/1434	4.63	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	2	9	4.25	838/1547	4.25	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	328/1574	4.94	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	11	2	3.94	1019/1554	3.94	4.08	4.10	4.09	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	1048/1488	4.33	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	658/1493	4.87	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	821/1486	4.40	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	660/1489	4.53	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	585/1277	4.20	3.63	4.03	4.11	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	771/1279	4.10	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	2	0	7	4.30	805/1270	4.30	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	0	1	1	6	3.90	992/1269	3.90	4.48	4.35	4.41	3.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.02	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	3.85	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	B 11	Graduate	0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	9
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 382 0101  
 Title FEATURE WRITING  
 Instructor: CORBETT, CHRIS  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 749  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	554/1576	4.56	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	364/1576	4.69	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	298/1342	4.75	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	476/1520	4.53	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	4	1	9	4.36	554/1465	4.36	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	126/1434	4.87	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.87	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	992/1547	4.07	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	1033/1574	4.56	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	558/1554	4.38	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	442/1488	4.79	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	298/1486	4.79	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	336/1489	4.79	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1277	****	3.63	4.03	4.11	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	204/1279	4.83	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	326/1270	4.83	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.48	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	4.02	4.05	4.09	4.50	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	3.85	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.25	4.01	4.12	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0101  
 Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT  
 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 750  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	0	2	3.57	1420/1576	3.73	4.12	4.30	4.30	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	0	2	3.29	1478/1576	3.90	4.22	4.27	4.28	3.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	4.56	4.32	4.32	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1041/1520	4.20	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	850/1465	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1033/1434	4.14	4.31	4.14	4.15	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	1255/1547	4.24	4.07	4.19	4.21	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1227/1554	3.85	4.08	4.10	4.09	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	1476/1488	3.72	4.35	4.47	4.47	2.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1411/1493	4.60	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1392/1486	3.78	4.30	4.32	4.32	3.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1451/1489	3.62	4.24	4.32	4.34	2.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1020/1277	3.15	3.63	4.03	4.11	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1000/1279	3.97	4.22	4.17	4.20	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	784/1270	4.26	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	4.71	4.48	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	3.92	4.02	4.05	4.09	****	

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 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 7 Non-major 5
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 responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0201  
 Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT  
 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 751  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	3	1	3.18	1512/1576	3.73	4.12	4.30	4.30	3.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1237/1576	3.90	4.22	4.27	4.28	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	972/1342	4.56	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1179/1520	4.20	4.32	4.25	4.25	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	3	3	3.64	1187/1465	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.09	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	878/1434	4.14	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	527/1547	4.24	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	1309/1574	4.50	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	3	0	3.29	1381/1554	3.85	4.08	4.10	4.09	3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1233/1488	3.72	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	4.60	4.72	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	1330/1486	3.78	4.30	4.32	4.32	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	1313/1489	3.62	4.24	4.32	4.34	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	1257/1277	3.15	3.63	4.03	4.11	2.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	910/1279	3.97	4.22	4.17	4.20	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	1107/1270	4.26	4.49	4.35	4.42	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	894/1269	4.71	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	671/ 878	3.92	4.02	4.05	4.09	3.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0401  
 Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT  
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 752  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	757/1576	3.73	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	608/1576	3.90	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	406/1342	4.56	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	291/1520	4.20	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	366/1465	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	345/1434	4.14	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	527/1547	4.24	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	832/1574	4.50	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	331/1554	3.85	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	786/1488	3.72	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	849/1493	4.60	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	499/1486	3.78	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	614/1489	3.62	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	1	1	0	4	3.71	916/1277	3.15	3.63	4.03	4.11	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	582/1279	3.97	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	345/1270	4.26	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1269	4.71	4.48	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	405/ 878	3.92	4.02	4.05	4.09	4.18
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.58	4.72	4.67	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		



Course-Section: ENGL 392 0101  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 753  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	637/1576	4.67	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.28	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	4.77	4.32	4.25	4.25	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.31	4.14	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	527/1547	4.58	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1574	4.70	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	395/1554	4.45	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	4.61	4.22	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	4.94	4.49	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	4.78	4.48	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.02	4.05	4.09	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0201  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 754  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	4.67	4.12	4.30	4.30	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.28	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	4.77	4.32	4.25	4.25	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.16	4.12	4.09	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.31	4.14	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1547	4.58	4.07	4.19	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	4.70	4.43	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1554	4.45	4.08	4.10	4.09	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	4.61	4.22	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	4.94	4.49	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	4.78	4.48	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.02	4.05	4.09	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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0					
				I 0	Other 2				
				? 0					

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0301  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 755  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1520	4.77	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.16	4.12	4.09	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.31	4.14	4.15	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1547	4.58	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1262/1574	4.70	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1554	4.45	4.08	4.10	4.09	5.00	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	4.61	4.22	4.17	4.20	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	4.94	4.49	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	4.78	4.48	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.02	4.05	4.09	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	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	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0401  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 756  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1520	4.77	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	270/1434	4.88	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1041/1547	4.58	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1574	4.70	4.43	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.45	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	4.90	4.35	4.47	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	4.80	4.30	4.32	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.90	4.24	4.32	4.34	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	4.61	4.22	4.17	4.20	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	4.94	4.49	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1269	4.78	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.02	4.05	4.09	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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0501  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 757  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	861/1576	4.67	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	851/1576	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1520	4.77	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.16	4.12	4.09	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.31	4.14	4.15	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1276/1547	4.58	4.07	4.19	4.21	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1574	4.70	4.43	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	924/1554	4.45	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	870/1488	4.90	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1101/1486	4.80	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	696/1489	4.90	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1186/1279	4.61	4.22	4.17	4.20	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	4.94	4.49	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	928/1269	4.78	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0601  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 758  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	861/1576	4.67	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1576	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1294/1342	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.30	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1520	4.77	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	270/1434	4.88	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	527/1547	4.58	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	911/1574	4.70	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1554	4.45	4.08	4.10	4.09	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0701  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 759  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	4.67	4.12	4.30	4.30	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1138/1576	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	4.77	4.32	4.25	4.25	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.31	4.14	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	4.58	4.07	4.19	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	4.70	4.43	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.45	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	4.90	4.35	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	4.80	4.30	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.90	4.24	4.32	4.34	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	802/1279	4.61	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	4.94	4.49	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	4.78	4.48	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.02	4.05	4.09	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0801  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 760  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	637/1576	4.67	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1138/1576	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1041/1520	4.77	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	398/1434	4.88	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1547	4.58	4.07	4.19	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1574	4.70	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	924/1554	4.45	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1279	4.61	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	636/1270	4.94	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1269	4.78	4.48	4.35	4.41	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	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						



Course-Section: ENGL 392 0901  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 761  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1576	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	4.77	4.32	4.25	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.31	4.14	4.15	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	4.58	4.07	4.19	4.21	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.70	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1554	4.45	4.08	4.10	4.09	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	4.90	4.35	4.47	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	4.80	4.30	4.32	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.90	4.24	4.32	4.34	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	4.61	4.22	4.17	4.20	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	4.94	4.49	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	4.78	4.48	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.02	4.05	4.09	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	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 392 1001  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 762  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	4.67	4.12	4.30	4.30	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	608/1576	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	4.77	4.32	4.25	4.25	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.16	4.12	4.09	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.31	4.14	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	527/1547	4.58	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	4.70	4.43	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.45	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	4.90	4.35	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1486	4.80	4.30	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	4.90	4.24	4.32	4.34	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	4.61	4.22	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	4.94	4.49	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	4.78	4.48	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.02	4.05	4.09	5.00
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	379/ 379	1.00	3.85	4.20	4.17	1.00

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

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0101  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: SIMS, DIANA  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 763  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	2	6	1	6	3.28	1502/1576	3.75	4.12	4.30	4.30	3.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	4	5	3	3.17	1503/1576	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.28	3.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1089/1342	4.27	4.32	4.32	4.30	3.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	7	6	3.89	1179/1520	4.31	4.32	4.25	4.25	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	8	3	3.33	1317/1465	3.83	4.16	4.12	4.09	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	0	8	6	3.78	1081/1434	4.23	4.31	4.14	4.15	3.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	0	3	9	3.72	1251/1547	3.98	4.07	4.19	4.21	3.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	13	4	0	0	1	1.44	1574/1574	4.12	4.43	4.64	4.61	1.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	2	2	4	6	3	3.35	1362/1554	3.87	4.08	4.10	4.09	3.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	5	4	6	3.71	1363/1488	4.24	4.35	4.47	4.47	3.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	1210/1493	4.55	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	5	7	3	3.44	1349/1486	4.15	4.30	4.32	4.32	3.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	4	6	3	3.22	1387/1489	3.93	4.24	4.32	4.34	3.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	2	1	4	3	5	3.53	1006/1277	3.88	3.63	4.03	4.11	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	554/1279	4.11	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	355/1270	4.40	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	728/1269	4.28	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 878	3.84	4.02	4.05	4.09	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 1 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 4	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 17 Non-major 18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 12	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0301  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 764  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	2	8	3	6	3.55	1427/1576	3.75	4.12	4.30	4.30	3.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	4	6	4	6	3.48	1405/1576	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.28	3.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	735/1342	4.27	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	4	10	4.00	1041/1520	4.31	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	3	1	1	4	5	3.50	1242/1465	3.83	4.16	4.12	4.09	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	8	8	4.00	878/1434	4.23	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	6	2	4	8	3.57	1316/1547	3.98	4.07	4.19	4.21	3.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	10	6	4	3.62	1549/1574	4.12	4.43	4.64	4.61	3.62	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	2	2	3	5	1	3.08	1436/1554	3.87	4.08	4.10	4.09	3.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	1126/1488	4.24	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	2	2	6	8	4.11	1398/1493	4.55	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.11	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	3	6	7	4.00	1101/1486	4.15	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	7	6	3.89	1200/1489	3.93	4.24	4.32	4.34	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	404/1277	3.88	3.63	4.03	4.11	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	532/1279	4.11	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	636/1270	4.40	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	535/1269	4.28	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 878	3.84	4.02	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 240	****	3.20	4.35	4.32	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 379	****	3.85	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.58	4.72	4.67	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	4.13	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.43	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	3.50	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	3.50	4.73	4.63	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	4.38	4.60	4.83	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.25	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	****	4.38	4.78	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

P	1			responses to be significant
I	1	Other	14	
?	0			

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0401  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: ROCKETT, DANIKA  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 765  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	1000/1576	3.75	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	364/1576	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	455/1342	4.27	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	270/1520	4.31	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	587/1465	3.83	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	252/1434	4.23	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.68	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	445/1547	3.98	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	7	4.39	1219/1574	4.12	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.39	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	532/1554	3.87	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	442/1488	4.24	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	582/1493	4.55	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	366/1486	4.15	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	336/1489	3.93	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	11	6	4.11	653/1277	3.88	3.63	4.03	4.11	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	575/1279	4.11	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	412/1270	4.40	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	567/1269	4.28	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	3.84	4.02	4.05	4.09	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0501  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: SINGH, YASHODA  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 766  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	1	4	6	6	3.43	1474/1576	3.75	4.12	4.30	4.30	3.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	2	7	8	3.86	1264/1576	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.28	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	709/1342	4.27	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	7	11	4.29	826/1520	4.31	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	8	9	4.00	850/1465	3.83	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	4	11	4.00	878/1434	4.23	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	8	8	4.10	978/1547	3.98	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	235/1574	4.12	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	5	8	3	3.61	1260/1554	3.87	4.08	4.10	4.09	3.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	3	2	4	8	3.83	1334/1488	4.24	4.35	4.47	4.47	3.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	0	7	9	4.22	1366/1493	4.55	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.22	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	2	7	6	3.83	1222/1486	4.15	4.30	4.32	4.32	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	0	2	6	5	3.33	1363/1489	3.93	4.24	4.32	4.34	3.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	2	2	5	6	3.65	953/1277	3.88	3.63	4.03	4.11	3.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	1	2	4	2	3.27	1143/1279	4.11	4.22	4.17	4.20	3.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	1030/1270	4.40	4.49	4.35	4.42	3.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	0	4	1	4	3.45	1129/1269	4.28	4.48	4.35	4.41	3.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	654/ 878	3.84	4.02	4.05	4.09	3.71	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 234	****	3.83	4.23	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	3.50	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	3.85	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.60	3.22	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 15	Required for Majors	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0601  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: SINGH, YASHODA  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 767  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	3	5	4	5	5	3.18	1512/1576	3.75	4.12	4.30	4.30	3.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	7	9	4.09	1082/1576	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	1	2	4	3	4	3.50	1209/1342	4.27	4.32	4.32	4.30	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	8	10	4.23	891/1520	4.31	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	4	7	7	3.81	1067/1465	3.83	4.16	4.12	4.09	3.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	4	8	7	3.86	1027/1434	4.23	4.31	4.14	4.15	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	7	4	10	4.00	1041/1547	3.98	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	813/1574	4.12	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	7	5	9	4.10	876/1554	3.87	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	4	7	8	4.21	1142/1488	4.24	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	1029/1493	4.55	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	4	7	7	4.00	1101/1486	4.15	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	4	6	6	3.74	1262/1489	3.93	4.24	4.32	4.34	3.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	2	4	6	4	3.75	889/1277	3.88	3.63	4.03	4.11	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	918/1279	4.11	4.22	4.17	4.20	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	881/1270	4.40	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	882/1269	4.28	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 878	3.84	4.02	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	3.85	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.58	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.13	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.43	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.60	3.22	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 15	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 23	Non-major 23
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 17		
				? 0			



Course-Section: ENGL 393 0801  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: HICKERNELL, MAR  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 768  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	1	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	11	2	3.50	1445/1576	3.75	4.12	4.30	4.30	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	5	5	3.55	1380/1576	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.28	3.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1342	4.27	4.32	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	9	4.10	994/1520	4.31	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	5	5	3	3	2.80	1426/1465	3.83	4.16	4.12	4.09	2.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	7	9	4.15	787/1434	4.23	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	6	6	3	4	3.15	1435/1547	3.98	4.07	4.19	4.21	3.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	7	4.35	1245/1574	4.12	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	6	9	1	3.44	1331/1554	3.87	4.08	4.10	4.09	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	4	8	6	3.85	1329/1488	4.24	4.35	4.47	4.47	3.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	1210/1493	4.55	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	3	10	5	3.85	1215/1486	4.15	4.30	4.32	4.32	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	7	6	4	3.50	1313/1489	3.93	4.24	4.32	4.34	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	958/1277	3.88	3.63	4.03	4.11	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1064/1279	4.11	4.22	4.17	4.20	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	928/1270	4.40	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	999/1269	4.28	4.48	4.35	4.41	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	688/ 878	3.84	4.02	4.05	4.09	3.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	3.83	4.23	4.24	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.20	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.00	4.51	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	3.50	4.29	4.16	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 379	****	3.85	4.20	4.17	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.58	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.13	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.43	4.61	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.12	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.50	4.40	3.92	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	3.50	4.73	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.75	4.57	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.23	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.38	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.25	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.25	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.38	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	208/ 382	3.60	3.22	4.08	4.24	3.60

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0801  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: HICKERNELL, MAR  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 768  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0901  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: ROCKETT, DANIKA  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 769  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	682/1576	3.75	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	434/1576	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	2	1	7	4.50	583/1342	4.27	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.50		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	487/1520	4.31	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	3	11	4.21	688/1465	3.83	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	314/1434	4.23	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.61	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	375/1547	3.98	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	987/1574	4.12	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	331/1554	3.87	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	547/1488	4.24	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	582/1493	4.55	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	366/1486	4.15	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	11	4.37	856/1489	3.93	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	438/1277	3.88	3.63	4.03	4.11	4.37	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	575/1279	4.11	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	458/1270	4.40	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	747/1269	4.28	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	400/ 878	3.84	4.02	4.05	4.09	4.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	3.83	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.20	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.00	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	3.50	4.29	4.16	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.58	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.13	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.43	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.38	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.25	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.25	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.38	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	3.60	3.22	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0901  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: ROCKETT, DANIKA  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 769  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 1001  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: JAMAL, MAHBUB  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 770  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	829/1576	3.75	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	653/1576	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	430/1342	4.27	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	320/1520	4.31	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	277/1465	3.83	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	167/1434	4.23	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	5	8	4.11	963/1547	3.98	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	488/1574	4.12	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	10	6	4.38	571/1554	3.87	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	786/1488	4.24	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	1089/1493	4.55	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	545/1486	4.15	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	614/1489	3.93	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	2	1	0	3	4	3.60	974/1277	3.88	3.63	4.03	4.11	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	335/1279	4.11	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	636/1270	4.40	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	535/1269	4.28	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 878	3.84	4.02	4.05	4.09	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 382	3.60	3.22	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 11	Graduate	0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 393E 0101  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: SLYTHOMPSON, AL  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 771  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	0	2	5	3.50	1445/1576	3.50	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.30	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	2	5	3.58	1372/1576	3.58	4.22	4.27	4.27	4.28	3.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.32	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	1	6	3.75	1256/1520	3.75	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.25	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	2	0	5	3.25	1337/1465	3.25	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.09	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	0	7	3.83	1045/1434	3.83	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.15	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	0	1	2	5	3.55	1329/1547	3.55	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.21	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	645/1574	4.82	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.61	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	1227/1554	3.67	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.09	3.67
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	1379/1493	4.18	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.18	4.18
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1265/1486	3.73	4.30	4.32	4.32	3.73	3.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	0	4	4	3.64	1290/1489	3.64	4.24	4.32	4.34	3.64	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	3	0	1	1	2	2.86	1198/1277	2.86	3.63	4.03	4.11	2.86	2.86
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	0	7	4.20	712/1279	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.20	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.00	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	907/1269	4.10	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.10	4.10
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	425/ 878	4.14	4.02	4.05	4.09	4.14	4.14
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	3.83	4.23	4.24	****	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.20	4.35	4.32	****	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.00	4.51	4.48	****	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	3.50	4.29	4.16	****	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	3.85	4.20	4.17	****	****
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.58	4.72	4.67	5.00	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.69	5.00	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	44/ 72	4.67	4.13	4.64	4.53	4.67	4.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	64/ 80	4.33	4.43	4.61	4.22	4.33	4.33
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	3.25	4.01	4.12	5.00	5.00
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.48	4.37	****	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.50	4.40	3.92	****	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	****	3.50	4.73	4.63	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.75	4.57	4.50	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.23	****	****
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.38	4.60	4.83	5.00	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	4.25	4.83	4.89	5.00	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.25	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	4.38	4.78	5.00	5.00	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	3.22	4.08	4.24	5.00	5.00

Course-Section: ENGL 393E 0101  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: SLYTHOMPSON, AL  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 771  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 394 0101  
 Title TECHNICAL EDITING  
 Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 772  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	1	3	0	1	2.22	1571/1576	2.22	4.12	4.30	4.30	2.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	1	2	3.00	1523/1576	3.00	4.22	4.27	4.28	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1330/1520	3.60	4.32	4.25	4.25	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1364/1465	3.13	4.16	4.12	4.09	3.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	0	0	2	2.67	1407/1434	2.67	4.31	4.14	4.15	2.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	4	1	2	3.38	1387/1547	3.38	4.07	4.19	4.21	3.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	2	4	1	1	1	2.44	1571/1574	2.44	4.43	4.64	4.61	2.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	2	3	1	0	2.38	1534/1554	2.38	4.08	4.10	4.09	2.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	3	1	1	2.75	1470/1488	2.75	4.35	4.47	4.47	2.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	3	0	4	3.75	1454/1493	3.75	4.72	4.73	4.70	3.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	1	2	3.38	1367/1486	3.38	4.30	4.32	4.32	3.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	1	0	2	2.63	1461/1489	2.63	4.24	4.32	4.34	2.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	987/1277	3.57	3.63	4.03	4.11	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	****	4.22	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1270	****	4.49	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	4.48	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.02	4.05	4.09	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: ENGL 401 0101  
 Title METHOD OF INTERPRETATI  
 Instructor: STEWART, CAROLE  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 773  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	443/1576	4.57	4.12	4.30	4.46	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	825/1576	4.37	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	430/1342	4.57	4.32	4.32	4.46	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	429/1520	4.47	4.32	4.25	4.38	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	187/1465	4.64	4.16	4.12	4.22	4.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	345/1434	4.35	4.31	4.14	4.30	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	207/1547	4.33	4.07	4.19	4.24	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	702/1574	4.46	4.43	4.64	4.69	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	752/1554	4.32	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	223/1488	4.90	4.35	4.47	4.55	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1493	4.81	4.72	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1197/1486	4.14	4.30	4.32	4.41	3.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1118/1489	4.38	4.24	4.32	4.38	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.63	4.03	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	381/1279	4.44	4.22	4.17	4.31	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	0	1	7	4.20	855/1270	4.46	4.49	4.35	4.53	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	728/1269	4.56	4.48	4.35	4.55	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	383/ 878	4.22	4.02	4.05	4.33	4.22	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 401 0201  
 Title: METHOD OF INTERPRETATI  
 Instructor: FERNANDEZ, JEAN  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 774  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	637/1576	4.57	4.12	4.30	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	798/1576	4.37	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	583/1342	4.57	4.32	4.32	4.46	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	719/1520	4.47	4.32	4.25	4.38	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	366/1465	4.64	4.16	4.12	4.22	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	816/1434	4.35	4.31	4.14	4.30	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1167/1547	4.33	4.07	4.19	4.24	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	1411/1574	4.46	4.43	4.64	4.69	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	504/1554	4.32	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	293/1488	4.90	4.35	4.47	4.55	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1101/1493	4.81	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	851/1486	4.14	4.30	4.32	4.41	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	378/1489	4.38	4.24	4.32	4.38	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1277	4.00	3.63	4.03	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	641/1279	4.44	4.22	4.17	4.31	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	458/1270	4.46	4.49	4.35	4.53	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	491/1269	4.56	4.48	4.35	4.55	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	4.22	4.02	4.05	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 407 0101  
 Title LANGUAGE IN SOCIETY  
 Instructor: MCCARTHY, LUCIL  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 775  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	471/1576	4.63	4.12	4.30	4.46	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	448/1576	4.63	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	2	3	4.60	480/1342	4.60	4.32	4.32	4.46	4.60		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	395/1520	4.60	4.32	4.25	4.38	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	85/1465	4.94	4.16	4.12	4.22	4.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	146/1434	4.81	4.31	4.14	4.30	4.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	387/1547	4.63	4.07	4.19	4.24	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	1165/1574	4.44	4.43	4.64	4.69	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	263/1554	4.67	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	505/1488	4.75	4.35	4.47	4.55	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	632/1493	4.88	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	201/1486	4.88	4.30	4.32	4.41	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.24	4.32	4.38	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	3	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	856/1277	3.80	3.63	4.03	4.04	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	169/1279	4.91	4.22	4.17	4.31	4.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.49	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.48	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	187/ 878	4.60	4.02	4.05	4.33	4.60	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 431 0101  
 Title SEMINAR:BRIT & AMER LI  
 Instructor: GWIAZDA, PIOTR  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 776  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	582/1576	4.55	4.12	4.30	4.46	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	434/1576	4.64	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.32	4.32	4.46	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	191/1520	4.82	4.32	4.25	4.38	4.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	169/1465	4.82	4.16	4.12	4.22	4.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	368/1434	4.55	4.31	4.14	4.30	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	179/1547	4.82	4.07	4.19	4.24	4.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	866/1574	4.70	4.43	4.64	4.69	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	263/1554	4.67	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1488	****	4.35	4.47	4.55	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1493	****	4.72	4.73	4.80	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1486	****	4.30	4.32	4.41	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1489	****	4.24	4.32	4.38	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	3.63	4.03	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	****	4.22	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1270	****	4.49	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	4.48	4.35	4.55	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	52/ 85	4.82	4.58	4.72	4.77	4.82	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.69	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	41/ 72	4.73	4.13	4.64	4.64	4.73	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	42/ 80	4.64	4.43	4.61	4.52	4.64	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	142/ 375	4.73	3.25	4.01	3.90	4.73	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 442 0101  
 Title VISUAL LITERACY  
 Instructor: BURGESS, HELEN  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 777  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	443/1576	4.64	4.12	4.30	4.46	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	244/1576	4.79	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1342	****	4.32	4.32	4.46	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	385/1520	4.62	4.32	4.25	4.38	4.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.16	4.12	4.22	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	226/1434	4.71	4.31	4.14	4.30	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	1	8	4.21	882/1547	4.21	4.07	4.19	4.24	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.43	4.64	4.69	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	316/1554	4.60	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	505/1488	4.75	4.35	4.47	4.55	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	501/1493	4.92	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.30	4.32	4.41	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	274/1489	4.83	4.24	4.32	4.38	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	110/1277	4.89	3.63	4.03	4.04	4.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	179/1279	4.89	4.22	4.17	4.31	4.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.49	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.48	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	4.02	4.05	4.33	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.58	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.43	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	3.90	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	3.88	****	

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	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	0
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 448 0101  
 Title SEMINAR IN LIT & CULTU  
 Instructor: FERNANDEZ, JEAN  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 778  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	861/1576	4.33	4.12	4.30	4.46	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1248/1576	3.89	4.22	4.27	4.35	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1342	****	4.32	4.32	4.46	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	961/1520	4.14	4.32	4.25	4.38	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	335/1465	4.56	4.16	4.12	4.22	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.31	4.14	4.30	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	963/1547	4.11	4.07	4.19	4.24	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.43	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	532/1554	4.40	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	666/1488	4.67	4.35	4.47	4.55	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	1053/1493	4.67	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	561/1486	4.60	4.30	4.32	4.41	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.24	4.32	4.38	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	3.63	4.03	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	665/1279	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.31	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	541/1270	4.63	4.49	4.35	4.53	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.48	4.35	4.55	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.02	4.05	4.33	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.58	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.13	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.43	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	3.90	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 473 0101  
 Title ADV CREATIVE WRITG:POET  
 Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 779  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	568/1576	4.56	4.12	4.30	4.46	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	392/1576	4.67	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	683/1342	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.46	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.32	4.25	4.38	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	454/1465	4.44	4.16	4.12	4.22	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.31	4.14	4.30	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1325/1547	3.56	4.07	4.19	4.24	3.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1417/1574	4.11	4.43	4.64	4.69	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.08	4.10	4.24	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	750/1488	4.60	4.35	4.47	4.55	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.30	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.24	4.32	4.38	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1277	****	3.63	4.03	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	184/1279	4.88	4.22	4.17	4.31	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	288/1270	4.88	4.49	4.35	4.53	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	567/1269	4.63	4.48	4.35	4.55	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	367/ 878	4.25	4.02	4.05	4.33	4.25	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	3.88	****	

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 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 9	Non-major 4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 7		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ENGL 486 0101  
 Title SEMINAR IN TEACHING CO  
 Instructor: MCCARTHY, LUCIL  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 780  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.12	4.30	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.22	4.27	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.32	4.32	4.46	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.32	4.25	4.38	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.16	4.12	4.22	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	193/1434	4.75	4.31	4.14	4.30	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	238/1547	4.75	4.07	4.19	4.24	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	758/1574	4.75	4.43	4.64	4.69	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	504/1554	4.43	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.35	4.47	4.55	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.30	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.24	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.63	4.03	4.04	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.22	4.17	4.31	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.49	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.48	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.02	4.05	4.33	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.58	4.72	4.77	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	4.13	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.43	4.61	4.52	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: ENGL 686 0101  
 Title TEACHING COMP  
 Instructor: MCCARTHY, LUCIL  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 781  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.12	4.30	4.43	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.22	4.27	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.32	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.32	4.25	4.36	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.16	4.12	4.25	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.31	4.14	4.35	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.07	4.19	4.24	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.43	4.64	4.75	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.08	4.10	4.18	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.35	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.30	4.32	4.37	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.24	4.32	4.38	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.22	4.17	4.34	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.49	4.35	4.53	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.48	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.02	4.05	4.11	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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