AMERICAN HISTORY TO 18

Title Instructor: LINDENMEYER, KR

Enrollment: 74 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 960 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | Fre | equer | ncie | g | | Tnst | ructor | Course | Dent | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-----|-------|------|----|----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Ouestions | NR | 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 | 16 | 26 | 4.43 | 749/1649 | 4.43 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.11 | 4.43 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 33 | 4.57 | 475/1648 | 4.57 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.16 | 4.57 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 34 | 4.55 | 505/1375 | 4.55 | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.10 | 4.55 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 25 | 4.50 | 497/1595 | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.03 | 4.50 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 10 | 27 | 4.28 | 604/1533 | 4.28 | 4.27 | 4.04 | 3.87 | 4.28 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 12 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 11 | 18 | 4.23 | 723/1512 | 4.23 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 3.86 | 4.23 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 33 | 4.53 | 469/1623 | 4.53 | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.08 | 4.53 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 41 | 4.81 | 833/1646 | 4.81 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.67 | 4.81 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 31 | 4.66 | 243/1621 | 4.66 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 3.96 | 4.66 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 37 | 4.70 | 573/1568 | 4.70 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.70 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 42 | 4.91 | 532/1572 | 4.91 | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.64 | 4.91 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 37 | 4.72 | 406/1564 | 4.72 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.72 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 35 | 4.57 | 618/1559 | 4.57 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.20 | 4.57 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 34 | 4.64 | 227/1352 | 4.64 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.86 | 4.64 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 25 | 4.43 | 520/1384 | 4.43 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 3.86 | 4.43 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 28 | 4.60 | 540/1382 | 4.60 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.03 | 4.60 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 32 | 4.78 | 403/1368 | 4.78 | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.01 | 4.78 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 7 | 15 | 3.94 | 492/ 948 | 3.94 | 3.86 | 3.95 | 3.75 | 3.94 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 42 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 221 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.05 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | ****/ 243 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 4.08 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 42 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 212 | **** | **** | 4.40 | 4.43 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 43 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 209 | *** | **** | 4.35 | 4.38 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 5.00 | 1/ 555 | 5.00 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.14 | 5.00 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 43 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 88 | **** | 4.45 | 4.54 | 4.31 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 43 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.06 | 4.47 | 4.30 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 43 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 81 | **** | 4.38 | 4.43 | 4.39 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 43 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 92 | *** | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.01 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 42 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 288 | **** | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.54 | *** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 3.72 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.09 | 3.65 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 43 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.36 | *** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 43 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.38 | 4.37 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 42 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | ****/ 312 | **** | 4.00 | 3.68 | 3.51 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | ****/ 53 | **** | 5.00 | 4.30 | 4.17 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | ****/ 30 | **** | 4.00 | 4.16 | 4.06 | *** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 43 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | | ****/ 41 | **** | 5.00 | 4.43 | 4.27 | *** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 43 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 24 | **** | 4.00 | 4.42 | 4.24 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 43 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 110 | **** | 4.24 | 3.99 | 3.83 | *** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Title AMERICAN HISTORY TO 18

Instructor: Li

LINDENMEYER, KR

Enrollment: 74
Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 960 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expecte | d Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|---------|----------|---------------------|----|--------------|-------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 7 | 0.00-0.99 | 3 | А | 19 | Required for Majors | 22 | Graduate | 1 | Major | 2 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 19 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 2 | General | 6 | Under-grad | 46 | Non-major | 45 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 1 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 1 | Electives | 1 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | n |
| | | | | P | 1 | | | responses to | be si | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 15 | - | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Title AMER HIST SINCE 1877

Instructor: SMEAD, HOWARD

Enrollment: 44
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Page 961 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | Fre | eque | ncie | S | | Inst | tructor | Course | Dept | TIMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-----|------|------|----|----|------|-----------|--------|------|-------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| ~ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 14 | 4.62 | 497/1649 | | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.11 | 4.62 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 12 | 4.48 | 599/1648 | | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.16 | 4.48 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 4.52 | 529/1375 | 4.54 | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.10 | 4.52 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 4.45 | 566/1595 | | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.03 | 4.45 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 4.10 | | | 4.27 | 4.04 | 3.87 | 4.10 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | ****/1512 | 4.37 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 3.86 | **** |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 12 | 4.38 | 659/1623 | 4.34 | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.08 | 4.38 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 16 | 0 | 3.76 | 1620/1646 | 4.33 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.67 | 3.76 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 9 | 4.50 | 374/1621 | 4.38 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 3.96 | 4.50 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 13 | 4.62 | 715/1568 | 4.69 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.62 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 19 | 4.86 | 715/1572 | | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.64 | 4.86 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 16 | 4.71 | | | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.71 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 17 | 4.76 | | | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.20 | 4.76 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 7 | | 616/1352 | | | | 3.86 | 4.13 |
| | | | | | | | | | , | | | | | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4.09 | 764/1384 | | 4.12 | 4.08 | 3.86 | 4.09 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4.00 | 946/1382 | | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.03 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4.18 | | | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.01 | 4.18 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 10 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4.17 | 380/ 948 | 3.84 | 3.86 | 3.95 | 3.75 | 4.17 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 19 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 221 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.05 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 243 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 4.08 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 5.00 | 1/ 555 | 5.00 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.14 | 5.00 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 00 | ****/ 88 | **** | 4.45 | 4.54 | 4.31 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.06 | 4.47 | 4.30 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 81 | **** | 4.38 | 4.43 | 4.39 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 92 | | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.01 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 24/ 288 | | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.54 | |
| J. Here driveria for grading made drear | 13 | Ü | Ü | Ü | Ü | _ | Ü | 1.75 | 21/ 200 | 1.75 | 3.01 | 3.00 | 3.31 | 1.75 |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 52 | | **** | 4.06 | 3.72 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | , | **** | **** | 4.09 | 3.65 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | , | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.36 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.38 | 4.37 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/ 312 | **** | 4.00 | 3.68 | 3.51 | *** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | 5.00 | 4.30 | 4.17 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 30 | **** | 4.00 | 4.16 | 4.06 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 41 | **** | 5.00 | 4.43 | 4.27 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | | **** | 4.00 | 4.42 | 4.24 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/ 110 | **** | 4.24 | 3.99 | 3.83 | **** |
| 5 • | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Title AMER HIST SINCE 1877

Instructor: SMEAD, HOWARD

Enrollment: 44
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 961 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|----------|--------|---------------------|---|--------------|-------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 4 | Required for Majors | 6 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 3 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 2 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 21 | Non-major | 18 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | n |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be si | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 6 | _ | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

AMER HIST SINCE 1877

Title Instructor: SCOTT, MICHELLE

Enrollment: 43 Questionnaires: 32

Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 962 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

| Questions | NR | NA | Fre | equei 2 | ncie 3 | s 4 | 5 | Inst Mean | ructor Rank | Course Mean | _ | UMBC Mean | | Sect Mean |
|---|----|----|-----|------------|-----------|--------|----|--------------|----------------|----------------|------|--------------|------|--------------|
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 16 | 4.23 | 996/1649 | 4.39 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.11 | 4.23 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 22 | 4.55 | 510/1648 | 4.43 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.16 | 4.55 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 25 | 4.71 | 360/1375 | | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.10 | 4.71 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | _ | 16 | 4.32 | 734/1595 | 4.35 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.03 | 4.32 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | | 18 | 4.32 | 555/1533 | 4.27 | 4.27 | 4.04 | 3.87 | 4.32 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 19 | 4.55 | 352/1512 | 4.37 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 3.86 | 4.55 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 17 | | 757/1623 | | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.08 | 4.30 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 11 | | 1310/1646 | | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.67 | 4.38 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 10 | 4.32 | , | | 4.26 | 4.06 | 3.96 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 25 | 4.71 | 573/1568 | 4.69 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.71 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 28 | 4.87 | 690/1572 | 4.86 | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.64 | 4.87 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 27 | 4.77 | 310/1564 | 4.66 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.77 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 25 | 4.68 | 499/1559 | 4.67 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.20 | 4.68 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 18 | 4.26 | 515/1352 | 4.23 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.86 | 4.26 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 12 | 4.29 | 655/1384 | 4.23 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 3.86 | 4.29 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 16 | 4.62 | 530/1382 | 4.22 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.03 | 4.62 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 17 | 4.71 | , | | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.01 | 4.71 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 11 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 3.90 | 533/ 948 | 3.84 | 3.86 | 3.95 | 3.75 | 3.90 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 29 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 221 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.05 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 243 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 4.08 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 29 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 212 | **** | **** | 4.40 | 4.43 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 29 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 209 | **** | **** | 4.35 | 4.38 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 5.00 | 1/ 555 | 5.00 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.14 | 5.00 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | | ****/ 88 | **** | 4.45 | 4.54 | 4.31 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 29 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.06 | 4.47 | 4.30 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 29 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 81 | **** | 4.38 | 4.43 | 4.39 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | | ****/ 92 | **** | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.01 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 27 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.20 | ****/ 288 | 4.75 | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.54 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 3.72 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.09 | 3.65 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.36 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.38 | 4.37 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | ****/ 312 | **** | 4.00 | 3.68 | 3.51 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | ****/ 53 | **** | 5.00 | 4.30 | 4.17 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 30 | **** | 4.00 | 4.16 | 4.06 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | ****/ 41 | **** | 5.00 | 4.43 | 4.27 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 24 | **** | 4.00 | 4.42 | 4.24 | **** |

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 30 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 110 **** 4.24 3.99 3.83 ****

Title AMER HIST SINCE 1877

Instructor: SCOTT, MICHELLE

Enrollment: 43
Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 962 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Credits E | Carned | Cum. GPA | | Expecte | d Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|-----------|--------|-----------|---|---------|----------|---------------------|----|--------------|--------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 6 | 0.00-0.99 | 2 | А | 8 | Required for Majors | 16 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 4 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 14 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 5 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 2 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 32 | Non-major | 28 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F | 0 | Electives | 2 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | ı |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 7 | _ | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Title AMER HIST SINCE 1877

Instructor: MERINGOLO, DENI

Enrollment: 78
Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 963 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Frequencies

Instructor

| | | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | Mean | | Mean | Mean | | |
|---------------------------------|------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--------|------|--------|-------|----------|----------|------|----------|----------------------|---------|---------|--------|--------------|--------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 1 | | Genera | _ | | 0 | • | 0 | 0 | 0 | - 4 | 0.0 | 4 22 | 051 /1640 | 4 20 | 4 46 | 4 00 | 4 11 | 4 22 |
| | | w insights,ski tor make clear | | | 0 | 0 | 0 1 | 0 | 8 6 | 14 17 | | 4.33 | | | | | 4.11 4.16 | 4.33 4.27 |
| | | estions reflec | _ | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | 18 | | 4.27 | 885/1648 694/1375 | | | 4.23 | | 4.27 |
| | | ations reflect | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 12 | | 4.38 | | | | | 4.10 | |
| | | | | hat you learned | 0 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 15 | | 4.39 | | | | | 3.87 | |
| | _ | - | | what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 17 | | 4.18 | | | | 4.10 | 3.86 | |
| | | system clearl | | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 10 | | | 708/1623 | | | 4.10 | | 4.18 |
| | | - | | nea | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | | | 765/1646 | | | | | |
| | | was class cancerated rade the overal | | ing effectiveness | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | 632/1621 | | | | 4.67 3.96 | |
| | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Were + | he instru | Lecture ctor's lecture | | repared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 34 | 4.73 | 535/1568 | 4.69 | 4 54 | 4.43 | 4 39 | 4.73 |
| | | tor seem inter | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | | 4.86 | | | | | 4.64 | |
| | | | | plained clearly | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | 15 | | 4.49 | | | | | | |
| | | s contribute to | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 10 | | 4.57 | | | | | | |
| | | | | ur understanding | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 10 | | | 473/1352 | | | | | |
| 5. Did au | laiovisuai | techniques em | lance yo | ur understanding | | U | | 4 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 4.32 | 4/3/1352 | 4.23 | 4.07 | 3.90 | 3.00 | 4.32 |
| | | Discus | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | hat you learned | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 9 | | | 644/1384 | | | 4.08 | | 4.31 | |
| | | | to participate | 9 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | | | 941/1382 | | | | 4.03 | | |
| | | _ | | open discussion | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | | 4.72 | . , | | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.01 | 4.72 |
| 4. Were s | pecial ted | chniques succe | ssful | | 9 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 9 | 6 | 3.44 | 727/ 948 | 3.84 | 3.86 | 3.95 | 3.75 | 3.44 |
| | | Labora | tory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were r | equirement | | | arly specified | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 5.00 | 1/ 555 | 5.00 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.14 | 5.00 |
| | | Semina: | ~ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were c | riteria fo | or grading mad | | | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 288 | 4.75 | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.54 | **** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 Did | | Field 1 | | -14 | 4.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 00 | ++++/ 210 | | 4 00 | 2 60 | 2 51 | |
| 5. Dia co | nierences | neip you carr | y out ii | eld activities | 43 | U | U | U | 0 | 2 | U | 4.00 | ****/ 312 | * * * * | 4.00 | 3.68 | 3.51 | |
| | | Self | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were t | here enoug | gh proctors for | r all th | e students | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 110 | **** | 4.24 | 3.99 | 3.83 | **** |
| | | | | Frequ | ency | Dist | rib | ution | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits E | arnod | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | | | | Po: | ason | a | | | Ту | 20 | | | Majors | | |
| | | Cuiii. GPA | | | | | | | .b | | | | | | | | | |
| 00-27 | | | | | | | quire | ed fo | or M | ajor | s 2 | 16 | Graduat | е | 0 | Majo | or | 4 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В 22 | | | | _ | | | | | | _ | | | | |
| 56-83 | | | | | | | nera: | l | | | | 6 | Under-g | rad | 45 | Non- | major | 41 |
| 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grad. $0 	 3.50-4.00 	 3$ F 0 | | | | | | Ele | ecti | ves | | | | 1 | #### - 1 | | | | _ | h |
| | P 0 | | | | | | | | | | | _ | respons | es to | be sign | ificar | ıt | |
| | | | | I 0 | Other | | | | | | | 3 | | | | | | |
| | ? 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Title EAST-ASIAN CIVILIZATIO

VAPORIS, CONSTA

Instructor:

Enrollment: 78 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 964 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | Fre | equer | ncie | s | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept. | UMBC. | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-----|-------|------|----|----|------|-----------|--------|-------|-------|-------|------|
| Ouestions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | _ | | Mean | |
| ~~~~~ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 11 | 19 | 4.18 | 1047/1649 | 4.18 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.11 | 4.18 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 15 | 15 | 3.97 | 1155/1648 | 3.97 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.16 | 3.97 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 18 | 3.95 | 1000/1375 | 3.95 | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.10 | 3.95 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 12 | 15 | 3.87 | 1219/1595 | 3.87 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.03 | 3.87 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 20 | 4.23 | 643/1533 | 4.23 | 4.27 | 4.04 | 3.87 | 4.23 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 9 | 7 | 15 | 3.74 | 1131/1512 | 3.74 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 3.86 | 3.74 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 17 | 4.00 | 1029/1623 | 4.00 | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.08 | 4.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 24 | 4.63 | 1070/1646 | 4.63 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.67 | 4.63 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 11 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 9 | 4.12 | 847/1621 | 4.12 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 3.96 | 4.12 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 25 | 4.59 | 743/1568 | 4.59 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.59 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 34 | 4.89 | 615/1572 | 4.89 | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.64 | 4.89 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 19 | 4.22 | 981/1564 | 4.22 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.22 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 23 | 4.38 | 861/1559 | 4.38 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.20 | 4.38 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 21 | 4.25 | 515/1352 | 4.25 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.86 | 4.25 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 11 | 3.53 | 1068/1384 | 3.53 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 3.86 | 3.53 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 8 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 10 | 9 | | 1179/1382 | 3.59 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.03 | 3.59 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 8 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 14 | 3.94 | 1006/1368 | 3.94 | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.01 | 3.94 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 8 | 9 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 3.13 | 828/ 948 | 3.13 | 3.86 | 3.95 | 3.75 | 3.13 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Laboratory | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | 4 05 | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 35 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 221 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.05 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 35 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | ****/ 243 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 4.08 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 33 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ 212 | **** | **** | 4.40 | 4.43 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 34 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ 209 | **** | **** | 4.35 | 4.38 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 4.91 | 205/ 555 | 4.91 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.14 | 4.91 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 35 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 50 | ****/ 88 | **** | 4.45 | 4.54 | 4.31 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 35 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.06 | 4.47 | 4.30 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 34 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 81 | **** | 4.38 | 4.43 | 4.39 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 34 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 92 | **** | 3.93 | | 4.01 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 32 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | | ****/ 288 | **** | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.54 | **** |
| J. Were criteria for grading made crear | 22 | 1 | U | | 2 | | J | 3.00 | / 200 | | 3.01 | 3.00 | 3.31 | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 35 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3.40 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 3.72 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 35 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.60 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.09 | 3.65 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 35 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.36 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 35 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.38 | 4.37 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 36 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 312 | **** | 4.00 | | 3.51 | **** |
| | | _ | - | - | _ | - | _ | | , | | | | | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | ****/ 53 | **** | 5.00 | 4.30 | 4.17 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4.20 | ****/ 30 | **** | 4.00 | 4.16 | 4.06 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 35 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/ 41 | **** | 5.00 | 4.43 | 4.27 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 35 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.67 | ****/ 24 | **** | 4.00 | 4.42 | 4.24 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 35 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.67 | ****/ 110 | **** | 4.24 | 3.99 | 3.83 | **** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Title EAST-ASIAN CIVILIZATIO

Instructor: VAPORIS, CONSTA

Enrollment: 78
Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 964 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | d Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|----------|----------|---------------------|----|--------------|--------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 6 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | А | 8 | Required for Majors | 14 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 11 |
| 28-55 | 7 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 14 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 10 | General | 7 | Under-grad | 40 | Non-major | 29 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D | 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | h |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 12 | - | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

WESTERN CIV TO 1700

Title Instructor: BIRKENMEIER, JO

Enrollment: 45 Questionnaires: 27

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 965 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

| | | | Frequencies | | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept. | UMBC | Level | Sect | | |
|--|----------|-----|-------------|-------|---|------|--------|--------|-----------|-------|-------|------|------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | _ | | Mean | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 20 | 4.77 | 317/1649 | 4.77 | | 4.28 | 4.11 | 4.77 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 24 | 4.92 | 118/1648 | 4.92 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.16 | 4.92 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 5.00 | 1/1375 | 5.00 | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.10 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 19 | 4.69 | 291/1595 | 4.69 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.03 | 4.69 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 17 | 4.44 | 432/1533 | 4.44 | 4.27 | 4.04 | 3.87 | 4.44 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 15 | 4.24 | 711/1512 | 4.24 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 3.86 | 4.24 |
| Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 17 | 4.54 | 459/1623 | | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.08 | 4.54 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 24 | 4.96 | 266/1646 | 4.96 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.67 | 4.96 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 4.50 | 374/1621 | 4.50 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 3.96 | 4.50 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 22 | 4 05 | 220/1560 | 4 0 5 | 1 [1 | 1 12 | 4 20 | 4 05 |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 23 | 4.85 | 330/1568 | 4.85 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.85 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | | - | | 0 | 0 | 26 | 5.00 | 1/1572 | 5.00 | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.64 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 18 | 4.65 | 486/1564 | 4.65 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.65 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 4.85 | 272/1559 | 4.85 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.20 | 4.85 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 17 | 4.27 | 508/1352 | 4.27 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.86 | 4.27 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 4.12 | 755/1384 | 4.12 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 3.86 | 4.12 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 4.59 | 555/1382 | 4.59 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.03 | 4.59 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 13 | 4.71 | 484/1368 | 4.71 | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.01 | 4.71 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 10 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | | ****/ 948 | **** | 3.86 | | 3.75 | **** |
| 1. Here special commiques successful | | -5 | Ü | _ | Ü | Ü | 3 | 1.25 | , 510 | | 3.00 | 3.75 | 3.73 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | ****/ 243 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 4.08 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 5.00 | 1/ 555 | 5.00 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.14 | 5.00 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 25 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 00 | ****/ 88 | **** | 4.45 | 4.54 | 4.31 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.06 | 4.47 | 4.30 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | ****/ 81 | **** | 4.38 | 4.43 | 4.39 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 25 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ 92 | **** | 3.93 | 4.43 | 4.01 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | | ****/ 288 | **** | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.54 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made crear | 23 | 1 | U | U | U | ۷ | Τ | 4.33 | / 200 | | 3.01 | 3.00 | 3.54 | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 3.72 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.09 | 3.65 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 25 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.36 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 22 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 312 | **** | 4.00 | 3.68 | 3.51 | **** |
| Calf Damed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Self Paced | 2.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 E0 | ****/ 53 | **** | E 00 | 4 20 | 1 17 | **** |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 25 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | ****/ 30 | **** | 5.00 | 4.30 | 4.17 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | ∠5 | U | U | U | U | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | , 30 | | 4.00 | 4.16 | 4.06 | |
| Frequ | ency | Dis | tribu | ution | า | | | | | | | | | |

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grade | es Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|----------------|---------------------|----|--------------|-------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 5 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 12 | Required for Majors | 13 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | в 7 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 5 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C 3 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 27 | Non-major | 27 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 7 | F 0 | Electives | 1 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | ı |

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 5 ? 1

Title WESTERN CIV SINCE 1700

Instructor: BIRKENMEIER, JO

Enrollment: 46
Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 966 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

| | | | | Fre | eque: | ncie | S | | Ins | tructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect | | | |
|-------------|----------|------------------|---|--|-------|--|-------|-------|-------|---------|--------|------|-----------|---------|--------|---|--|------|
| | | Questions | 5 | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | General | L | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did vou | gain ne | | | this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 11 | 4.15 | 1067/1649 | 4.33 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.11 | 4.15 |
| _ | _ | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 15 | | | | | 4.23 | 4.16 | 4.54 |
| 3. Did the | exam qu | estions reflect | the exp | ected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 24 | 4.92 | 133/1375 | 4.71 | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.10 | 4.92 |
| | | | | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 7 | 3.96 | 1121/1595 | 3.98 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.03 | 3.96 |
| Did ass | igned re | adings contribu | ıte to wh | at you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 11 | 4.15 | 710/1533 | 4.11 | 4.27 | 4.04 | 3.87 | 4.15 |
| . Did wri | tten ass | ignments contri | bute to | what you learned | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 10 | 5 | 3.58 | 1214/1512 | 3.66 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 3.86 | 3.58 |
| | | system clearly | | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 13 | 4.19 | 883/1623 | 4.38 | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.08 | 4.19 |
| B. How man | y times | was class cance | elled | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 5.00 | 1/1646 | 5.00 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.67 | 5.00 |
| | | | | ng effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 9 | 4.35 | 583/1621 | 4.33 | 4.26 | Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean | 4.35 | |
| | | Lecture | 2 | | | NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| l. Were the | e instru | | = | epared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 19 | 4.65 | 652/1568 | 4.71 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.65 |
| | | | NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean | 4.88 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | 0 0 0 0 0 0 26 5.00 1/1646 5.00 4.76 4.69 4.67 5 aching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 1 13 9 4.35 583/1621 4.33 4.26 4.06 3.96 4 1 prepared 0 0 0 0 2 5 19 4.65 652/1568 4.71 4.54 4.43 4.39 4 in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 1 24 4.88 640/1572 4.89 4.84 4.70 4.64 4 explained clearly 1 0 0 0 1 8 16 4.60 550/1564 4.59 4.46 4.28 4.20 4 tyou learned 0 0 0 0 2 7 17 4.58 618/1559 4.66 4.48 4.29 4.20 4 your understanding 0 1 0 2 5 9 9 4.00 690/1352 4.13 4.07 3.98 3.86 4 ged to participate 19 0 0 2 1 2 2 3.29 1181/1384 3.64 4.12 4.08 3.86 3 ged to participate 19 0 0 2 1 2 2 3.57 1187/1382 4.02 4.36 4.29 4.03 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean | | |
| | | | | | - | | - | - | _ | | | | | | | | | |
| o. Did aud. | IOVISUAI | . teciniiques em | iance you | i understanding | U | 1 | U | 4 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 4.00 | 090/1352 | 4.13 | 4.07 | 3.90 | 3.00 | 4.00 |
| | | Discuss | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | - | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | 3.29 |
| | | | | | | | - | | | | 2 | | | | | | | 3.57 |
| | | | | open discussion | | | | | _ | | 2 | | -, | | | | | 3.71 |
| 4. Were sp | ecial te | chniques succes | ssful | | 19 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 948 | **** | 3.86 | 3.95 | 3.75 | **** |
| | | Laborat | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were re | quiremen | its for lab repo | orts clea | rly specified | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 5.00 | 1/ 555 | 5.00 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.14 | 5.00 |
| | | Seminar | <u>-</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 4.16 4.10 4.03 3.87 3.86 4.08 4.67 3.96 4.39 4.64 4.20 4.20 3.86 3.86 4.03 4.01 3.75 4.14 3.54 Majors or -major t enougi | |
| 5. Were cr | iteria f | or grading made | e clear | | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | ****/ 288 | **** | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.54 | **** |
| | | Field W | Jork | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Did con | ferences | help you carry | out fie | ld activities | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 312 | **** | 4.00 | 3.68 | 4.11 4.16 4.10 4.03 3.87 3.86 4.08 4.67 3.96 4.39 4.64 4.20 4.20 3.86 3.86 4.03 4.01 3.75 4.14 3.54 3.51 Majors or -major tenougi | *** |
| | | | | Frequ | ency | Dist | trib | utio: | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Ea | rned | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | | | Re | ason | s | | | Tyr | pe | | | Maiors | ; |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | - | | | Red | quire | ed f | or Ma | ajor | s 1 | .7 | Graduat | е | 0 | Majo | or | 2 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | | | | Gei | nera: | l | | | | 2 | Under-g | rad 2 | 6 | Non- | -major | 24 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 8 | | | Ele | ecti | ves | | | | 1 | | | | | _ | ſh |
| | | | | = - | | | | | | | | | respons | es to b | e sign | nificar | nt | |
| | | | | I 0 | | Otl | ner | | | | | 5 | | | | | | |
| | | | | s 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Title WESTERN CIV SINCE 1700

Instructor: GRUBB, JAMES S

Enrollment: 59
Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 967 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | NR | NA | Fre | equei 2 | ncie 3 | s 4 | 5 | Ins Mean | tructor Rank | Course Mean | Dept Mean | | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|--|----------|----|-----|------------|-----------|--------|----------|-------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------------|------|---------------|--------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | _ | | | _ | | | | | - 4 4 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 | 4 00 | | 4 00 | | 4 50 |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 1 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 0 | 2 4 | 8 5 | 19 21 | 4.50 | 644/1649 | | 4.46 4.38 | 4.28 | 4.11 | 4.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 21 | 4.57 | 487/1648 546/1375 | | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.16 4.10 | 4.57 4.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 13 | | 1067/1595 | | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.03 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 14 | 4.07 | 768/1533 | | 4.27 | 4.04 | 3.87 | 4.07 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 5 | 10 | | 1131/1512 | | 4.29 | 4.10 | 3.86 | 3.73 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 21 | 4.57 | 437/1623 | 4.38 | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.08 | 4.57 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 5.00 | 1/1646 | 5.00 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.67 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 10 | 4.31 | 632/1621 | 4.33 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 3.96 | 4.31 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 23 | 4.77 | 461/1568 | 4.71 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.77 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 27 | 4.90 | 591/1572 | | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.64 | 4.90 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 20 | 4.59 | 570/1564 | | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.59 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 23 | 4.73 | 419/1559 | | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.20 | 4.73 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 13 | 4.26 | 515/1352 | 4.13 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.86 | 4.26 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 4.00 | 795/1384 | 3.64 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 3.86 | 4.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 4.47 | 656/1382 | 4.02 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.03 | 4.47 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 9 | 4.44 | 722/1368 | | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.01 | 4.44 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 15 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/ 948 | **** | 3.86 | 3.95 | 3.75 | **** |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 30 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ 243 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 4.08 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 5.00 | 1/ 555 | 5.00 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.14 | 5.00 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 28 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 288 | **** | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.54 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 3.72 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.09 | 3.65 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ 39 | *** | **** | 4.47 | 4.36 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.38 | 4.37 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 312 | **** | 4.00 | 3.68 | 3.51 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 53 | **** | 5.00 | 4.30 | 4.17 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 30 | **** | 4.00 | 4.16 | 4.06 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 41 | **** | 5.00 | 4.43 | 4.27 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 30 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 24 ****/ 110 | **** | 4.00 4.24 | 4.42 | 4.24 | **** |
| o. were there enough proctors for all the students | 30 | U | U | U | U | Т | U | 4.00 | / IIO | | 4.24 | 3.99 | 3.83 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Credits 1 | Earned | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grad | es Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|-----------|--------|-----------|---|---------------|---------------------|----|--------------|-------|------------------|----|
| 00-27 | 6 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А б | Required for Majors | 13 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 5 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | в 13 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C 4 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 31 | Non-major | 26 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F 0 | Electives | 1 | #### - Means | there | e are not enough | 1 |

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 6 0

Course-Section: HIST 111Y 0101

Title WESTERN CIV SINCE 1700

Instructor: GRUBB, JAMES S

Enrollment: 20

Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 968 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | Fre | equer | ncies | 5 | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-----|-------|-------|---|----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 4.20 | 1027/1649 | 4.20 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.11 | 4.20 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 4.40 | 702/1648 | 4.40 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.16 | 4.40 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 4.50 | 546/1375 | 4.50 | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.10 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 4.17 | 930/1595 | 4.17 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.03 | 4.17 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 4.46 | 410/1533 | 4.46 | 4.27 | 4.04 | 3.87 | 4.46 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3.54 | 1246/1512 | 3.54 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 3.86 | 3.54 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 4.73 | 241/1623 | 4.73 | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.08 | 4.73 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1646 | 5.00 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.67 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 4.23 | 709/1621 | 4.23 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 3.96 | 4.23 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 4.93 | 171/1568 | 4.93 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.93 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 4.93 | 414/1572 | 4.93 | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.64 | 4.93 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 4.73 | 374/1564 | 4.73 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.73 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 4.87 | 250/1559 | 4.87 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.20 | 4.87 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 4.53 | 286/1352 | | 4.07 | | 3.86 | 4.53 |
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 3.73 | 976/1384 | 3.73 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 3.86 | 3.73 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 4.43 | 696/1382 | 4.43 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.03 | 4.43 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 11 | 4.64 | 541/1368 | 4.64 | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.01 | 4.64 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3.20 | 811/ 948 | 3.20 | 3.86 | 3.95 | | 3.20 |
| • | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5.00 | 1/ 555 | 5.00 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.14 | 5.00 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 288 | **** | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.54 | **** |
| n' 11 m 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Field Work | | | • | • | | _ | _ | - 00 | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 3.72 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.09 | 3.65 | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.36 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.38 | 4.37 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/ 312 | **** | 4.00 | 3.68 | 3.51 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | 5.00 | 4.30 | 4.17 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 30 | **** | 4.00 | 4.16 | 4.06 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 41 | **** | 5.00 | 4.43 | 4.27 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 24 | **** | 4.00 | 4.42 | 4.24 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 110 | **** | 4.24 | 3.99 | 3.83 | **** |
| 5 - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | Majors | |
|------------|-------|-----------|---|----------|--------|---------------------|---|--------------|-------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 6 | 0.00-0.99 | 2 | A | 4 | Required for Majors | 5 | Graduate | 1 | Major | 1 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 3 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 14 | Non-major | 14 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 1 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | n |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be si | gnificant | |

I 0 Other 5 ?

Title THEMES IN WORLD HISTOR

Instructor: KARS, MARJOLEIN

Enrollment: 79
Questionnaires: 43

IN WORLD HISTOR Baltimore County MARJOLEIN Fall 2008

Page 969 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

University of Maryland

| | | | | Fr | eaue | ncie | s | | Ins | tructor | Course | e Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------|---|-------|-------|--------|--------|------|-------|-----|------|-----------------------|--------|--------|------|--------------|------|
| | Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | Mean | | | Mean |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| l Did way gain no | General | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 23 | 1 21 | 1018/1649 | 4 21 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.29 | 4.2 |
| | w insights,skills from this course tor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 15 | 15 | | | | 4.38 | | | 3.9 |
| | estions reflect the expected goals | | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 15 | 18 | | 1176/1648 | | 4.56 | 4.23 | 4.25 | 4.1 |
| _ | ations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 6 | 6 | 15 | 13 | | 908/1375 1260/1595 | | 4.28 | 4.27 | 4.37 4.22 | 3.8 |
| | adings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 12 | 25 | | 555/1533 | | 4.20 | 4.20 | 4.22 | |
| _ | - | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 11 | | | | | | | | |
| | ignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | T | | 3 1 | - | | 17 | | 1022/1512 | | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.14 | 3.9 |
| | system clearly explained | 2 | - | 2 | | 6 | 6 | | | 768/1623 | | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.2 |
| _ | was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 1 | 0 | 0 | 23 | | | 1240/1646 | | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.63 | |
| . How would you g | rade the overall teaching effectiveness | 9 | U | Τ | 3 | 6 | 13 | ΤŢ | 3.88 | 1078/1621 | 3.88 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.01 | 3.8 |
| | Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| . Were the instru | ctor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 13 | 23 | 4.29 | 1096/1568 | 4.29 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.2 |
| . Did the instruc | tor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 35 | 4.74 | 967/1572 | 4.74 | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.73 | 4.7 |
| . Was lecture mat | erial presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 17 | 18 | 4.14 | 1046/1564 | 4.14 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.27 | 4.1 |
| . Did the lecture | s contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 28 | 4.38 | 851/1559 | 4.38 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4. |
| . Did audiovisual | techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 11 | 15 | 3.80 | 879/1352 | 3.80 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 4.07 | 3. |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Did class discu | Discussion ssions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 12 | 11 | 3 62 | 1029/1384 | 3.62 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 3.99 | 3.0 |
| | ts actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 9 | 15 | | 1057/1382 | | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.19 | 3.8 |
| | tor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 8 | 18 | 4.08 | | | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.21 | |
| | chniques successful | 6 | 26 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | | 912/ 948 | | | | 3.89 | |
| | 4 4 | - | | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | | , | _,_, | | | | |
| | Laboratory | | • | | | • | • | | | | | | | | |
| | ed with adequate background information | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 243 | | **** | 4.12 | 4.47 | *** |
| . were requiremen | ts for lab reports clearly specified | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 L | 4.94 | 159/ 555 | 4.94 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.9 |
| | Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| . Were assigned t | opics relevant to the announced theme | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 88 | **** | 4.45 | 4.54 | 3.75 | ** |
| . Was the instruc | tor available for individual attention | 42 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.06 | 4.47 | 3.33 | ** |
| . Did research pr | ojects contribute to what you learned | 42 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 81 | **** | 4.38 | 4.43 | 3.67 | * * |
| . Did presentation | ns contribute to what you learned | 42 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 92 | **** | 3.93 | 4.35 | 5.00 | ** |
| . Were criteria f | or grading made clear | 42 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 288 | **** | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.65 | * * |
| | Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Did conferences | help you carry out field activities | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 312 | **** | 4.00 | 3.68 | 3.59 | *** |
| | Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| . Were there enough | gh proctors for all the students | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 110 | **** | 4.24 | 3.99 | 3.72 | *** |
| | Freq | uency | / Dis | trih | utio | n | | | | | | | | | |
| | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA Expected Grades | | | | Re | ason | ເຮ | | | Ту: | pe | | | Majors | |
| 00-27 3 | 0.00-0.99 1 A 10 | | Re | quir | ed f | or M | laior | 'S | 5 | Graduat | e | 0 | Majo | or | 2.6 |

| Credits E | Carned | Cum. GPA | | Expecte | d Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | Majors | |
|-----------------|---------|------------------------|--------|---------|----------|---------------------|----|--------------|-------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 28-55 | 3 | 0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99 | 1 0 | A | 10 | Required for Majors | 5 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 26 |
| 56-83 | 2 11 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | B C | 16 12 | General | 6 | Under-grad | 43 | Non-major | 17 |
| 84-150 Grad. | 3 0 | 3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00 | 7 4 | D F | 0 0 | Electives | 2 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | n |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | | _ | |
| | | | | I ? | 0 1 | Other | 26 | | | | |

Title INTRO TO STUDY OF HIST

Instructor: MCDONOUGH, SUSA

Enrollment: 59
Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 970 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | Fre | eque | ncie | s | | Inst | tructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----------|----|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------|------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | Mean | | Mean | Mean |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 17 | 3.85 | 1319/1649 | 4.42 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.29 | 3.85 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 20 | | 1094/1648 | 4.53 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.25 | 4.05 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 33 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | | ****/1375 | 5.00 | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.37 | **** |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 13 | 13 | | 1254/1595 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.22 | 3.82 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 10 | 10 | 5 | | 1437/1533 | 4.01 | 4.27 | | 4.04 | 3.03 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 3 | | 16 | | 1062/1512 | 4.30 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.14 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 13 | 17 | | 1004/1623 | 4.40 | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.05 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 32 | | 816/1646 | 4.74 | 4.76 | 4.69 | | 4.82 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 8 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 16 | 7 | 3.90 | 1069/1621 | 4.45 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.01 | 3.90 |
| T a whoma | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lecture | _ | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | _ | 2.2 | 1 27 | 1010/1560 | 1 (0 | 4 54 | 4 42 | 4 20 | 4 27 |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 1 | 7 5 | 5 | 22 29 | | 1012/1568 | 4.69 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.37 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | s 8 | 1 7 | 29 17 | | 1133/1572 | 4.81 | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.73 | 4.61 3.97 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 4 4 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 9 | , 5 | 16 | | 1154/1564 1277/1559 | 4.49 4.38 | 4.46 4.48 | 4.28 4.29 | 4.27 4.33 | 3.97 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 9 | | | 1101/1352 | | 4.40 | 3.98 | 4.33 | |
| 5. Did addiovisual techniques emmance your understanding | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | TT | 9 | 0 | 3.41 | 1101/1352 | 3.34 | 4.07 | 3.90 | 4.07 | 3.41 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 10 | 3.81 | 931/1384 | 4.41 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 3.99 | 3.81 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 13 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 7 | | 4.07 | 929/1382 | 4.54 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.19 | 4.07 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 18 | 4.48 | 673/1368 | 4.74 | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.21 | 4.48 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 13 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 3.64 | 661/ 948 | 4.07 | 3.86 | 3.95 | 3.89 | 3.64 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 37 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 221 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.45 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 37 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1.67 | ****/ 243 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 4.47 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 37 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 212 | **** | **** | 4.40 | 4.62 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 37 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ 209 | **** | **** | 4.35 | 4.64 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 23 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 4.87 | 232/ 555 | 4.93 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.87 |
| Quantum and | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Seminar | 2.77 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 22 | ****/ OO | **** | 4 45 | 4 54 | 2 75 | **** |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 37 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 88 ****/ 85 | **** | 4.45 | 4.54 | 3.75 | **** |
| Was the instructor available for individual attention Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 37 37 | 0 | 0 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 1 | 1 1 | 3.33 | ****/ 85 ****/ 81 | **** | 4.06 4.38 | 4.47 4.43 | 3.33 3.67 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 37 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 92 | **** | 3.93 | 4.45 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 33 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | | ****/ 288 | 4.50 | 3.81 | 3.68 | | *** |
| J. Were criteria for grading made crear | 23 | U | | _ | U | J | U | 3.23 | / 200 | 1.50 | 3.01 | 3.00 | 3.03 | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 37 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.67 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 3.93 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 38 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.09 | 4.05 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 38 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.49 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 38 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.38 | 3.66 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 32 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | | ****/ 312 | **** | 4.00 | 3.68 | | **** |
| | - | - | | | - | - | - | | , | | | | | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 38 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/ 53 | **** | 5.00 | 4.30 | 4.07 | *** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 38 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 30 | **** | 4.00 | 4.16 | 1.50 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 41 | **** | 5.00 | 4.43 | 3.50 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 38 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.50 | ****/ 24 | **** | 4.00 | 4.42 | 2.00 | *** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 32 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 3.75 | ****/ 110 | **** | 4.24 | 3.99 | 3.72 | *** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Title INTRO TO STUDY OF HIST

Instructor: MCDO

MCDONOUGH, SUSA

Enrollment: 59
Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 970 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | d Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|------------|-------|-----------|---|----------|----------|---------------------|----|--------------|-------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | А | 11 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 32 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 14 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 5 | 2.00-2.99 | 5 | C | 7 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 40 | Non-major | 8 |
| 84-150 | 6 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D | 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 7 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | h |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be si | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 33 | - | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | |

Title INTRO TO STUDY OF HIST

Questions -----General

Instructor: NOLAN, ANDREW

Enrollment: 6
Ouestionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 971 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

| | | Genera | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|-----------|-----------------|---------|--------------------|------|-------------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|--------------|----------|--------|--------|--------|------|
| | | ew insights,ski | | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1649 | 4.42 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.29 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the | e instruc | ctor make clear | the ex | pected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1648 | 4.53 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.25 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the | e exam qu | estions reflec | t the e | xpected goals | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1375 | 5.00 | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.37 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did oth | her evalu | ations reflect | the ex | pected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1595 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.22 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did ass | signed re | eadings contrib | ute to | what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 4.01 | 4.27 | 4.04 | 4.04 | 5.00 |
| 6. Did wr | itten ass | signments contr | ibute t | o what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 194/1512 | 4.30 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.14 | 4.75 |
| 7. Was the | e gradino | system clearl | y expla | ined | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 220/1623 | 4.40 | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.75 |
| | | was class canc | | | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 1037/1646 | 4.74 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.63 | 4.67 |
| | | | | hing effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1621 | 4.45 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.01 | 5.00 |
| | | Lectur | e | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were th | he instru | actor's lecture | s well | prepared | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1568 | 4.69 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the | e instruc | ctor seem inter | ested i | n the subject | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1572 | 4.81 | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.73 | 5.00 |
| | | | | xplained clearly | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1564 | 4.49 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.27 | 5.00 |
| | | es contribute t | | | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | 1/1559 | 4.38 | | 4.29 | | 5.00 |
| | | | | our understanding | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.67 | | | | | | |
| J. Dia aa | alovibaai | _ | _ | our understanding | 3 | Ü | - | J | Ü | Ü | _ | 3.07 | 310/1332 | 3.31 | 1.07 | 3.70 | 1.07 | 3.07 |
| 1 Did ala | agg digg | Discus | | what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Δ | 5.00 | 1/1384 | 4 41 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 3.99 | 5.00 |
| | | | | d to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | | 1/1382 | | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.19 | 5.00 |
| | | _ | _ | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 5.00 | | | | | | |
| | | | | d open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | | 1/1368 | | 4.46 | | | 5.00 |
| 4. Were sp | pecial te | echniques succe | ssiul | | 2 | U | U | U | Ü | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 203/ 948 | 4.07 | 3.86 | 3.95 | 3.89 | 4.50 |
| | | Labora | - | | _ | | • | | • | | _ | | 4 / 555 | 4 00 | | 4 00 | 4 00 | |
| 5. Were re | equiremen | its for lab rep | orts cl | early specified | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/ 555 | 4.93 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 5.00 |
| F | | Semina | | | | | 0 | • | 0 | - | - | 4 50 | 25 / 202 | 4 50 | 2 01 | 2 60 | 2 65 | 4 50 |
| 5. were ci | riteria i | for grading mad | e clear | | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Τ | 4.50 | 37/ 288 | 4.50 | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.65 | 4.50 |
| | | Field | Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Did con | nferences | s help you carr | y out f | ield activities | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 312 | **** | 4.00 | 3.68 | 3.59 | **** |
| | | Self | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were th | here enou | igh proctors fo | r all t | he students | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 110 | **** | 4.24 | 3.99 | 3.72 | **** |
| | | | | Frequ | ency | Dis | trib | utio: | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | | | Re | ason | S | | | Тур | e | | | Majors | } |
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 3 | | Red | auir | ed f | or Ma | aiors | 5 | 0 | Graduate | ! | 0 | Majo | or | 4 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 1 | | | | | | , | | | | | |) (| | - |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C 0 | | Ger | nera | 1 | | | | 0 | Under-gr | ad | 6 | Non- | major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D 0 | | 001 | u. | _ | | | | - | onact gr | | - | 1,011 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 0 | F 0 | | ភ្ជា. | ecti | 7760 | | | | 0 | #### - M | leand + | here = | re not | enous | rh |
| Grau. | U | 3.30-4.00 | U | P 0 | | 11.1 | CCLI | v CD | | | | U | response | | | | _ | 111 |
| | | | | I O | | ∩ +1 | her | | | | | 4 | T CPFOIIPE | .b .co . | c sign | ıııcaı | | |
| | | | | ? 0 | | ULI | TICT | | | | | 7 | | | | | | |
| | | | | . 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: HIST 306 0101 University of Maryland Title THE FIRST WORLD WAR

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: LAURIE, CLAYTON

Questions

Enrollment: 99 Questionnaires: 65

Page 972 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean

| Student | Course | Eval | luation | Questio | onnaire |
|---------|--------|------|---------|---------|---------|
|---------|--------|------|---------|---------|---------|

Frequencies

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean

Instructor

Rank

| 1 544 | | General w insights,skills fro | | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 1.1 | 1 60 | F10/1640 | 4 60 | 1 10 | 4 00 | 4 07 | 1 60 |
|-----------|-------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|--------|----------|-------|------|-----------|---------|-----|----------|-----------|---------|--------------|--------|--------|------|
| | | etor make clear the ex | | 5 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 9 20 | 32 | 4.60 | | | 4.46 4.38 | | 4.27 | |
| | | estions reflect the e | | 4 | - | 0 | 1 | 6 | 10 | | | | | 4.66 | | | |
| | | ations reflect the ex | | 4 | | 2 | | | | | 4.19 | | | 4.28 | | 4.21 | |
| | | eadings contribute to | | 4 | | 1 | 3 | 9 | | | | | | 4.27 | | | |
| | | signments contribute t | | 5 | 0 | 1 | | | | | | 808/1512 | | | | 4.11 | |
| | | g system clearly expla | | 4 | | 1 | 1 | 4 | | | | 459/1623 | | 4.38 | | 4.08 | |
| | | was class cancelled | 11100 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | | 4.89 | | | 4.76 | | 4.67 | |
| | _ | grade the overall teac | hing effectiveness | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | | | | 261/1621 | | | | | |
| | | Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were t | the instru | actor's lectures well | prepared | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 48 | 4.76 | 461/1568 | 4.76 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.76 |
| | | ctor seem interested i | | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 6 | | | 740/1572 | | | | | |
| | | terial presented and e | | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | | | | 537/1564 | | | | | |
| | | es contribute to what | | 6 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 44 | 4.59 | 596/1559 | 4.59 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.23 | 4.59 |
| | | l techniques enhance y | | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 13 | 30 | 4.20 | 556/1352 | 4.20 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.97 | 4.20 |
| | | Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did cl | lass discu | ussions contribute to | what you learned | 35 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 11 | 3.30 | 1175/1384 | 3.30 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.11 | 3.30 |
| | | nts actively encourage | - | | 0 | 2 | | 6 | | | | 1191/1382 | | | | | |
| | | ctor encourage fair an | | 36 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | | | | | | 4.46 | | | |
| | | echniques successful | - | | 19 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 4.10 | ****/ 948 | **** | 3.86 | 3.95 | 4.00 | **** |
| | | Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were r | requiremen | nts for lab reports cl | early specified | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 5.00 | 1/ 555 | 5.00 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.22 | 5.00 |
| | | Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were c | criteria 1 | for grading made clear | | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 4.38 | ****/ 288 | **** | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.58 | **** |
| | | Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Did co | onferences | field work s help you carry out f | ield activities | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | ****/ 312 | **** | 4.00 | 3.68 | 3.60 | **** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | , | | | | | |
| 5 Were t | here eno | Self Paced agh proctors for all t | he students | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 4 20 | ****/ 110 | **** | 4 24 | 3 99 | 4 05 | **** |
| J. Well c | silere ello | ign procedib for air c | ne beaderes | 50 | Ü | Ü | Ü | Ü | | 3 | 1.20 | , 110 | | 1.21 | 3.55 | 1.05 | |
| | | | Frequ | iency | / Dist | trib | utic | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits E | Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | | | | Re | ason | ıs | | | Тур | e | | | Majors | ; |
| 00-27 | 1 | А 15 | | Re | quir | ed f | or M | Iajor | | 4 | Graduate | : : | 0 | Majo | r | 29 | |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 1 | В 30 | | | - | | | - | | | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 12 | 2.00-2.99 8 | C 6 | | Ger | nera: | 1 | | | 1 | 7 | Under-gr | ad 6 | 55 | Non- | major | 36 |
| 84-150 | 10 | 3.00-3.49 8 | D 0 | | | | | | | | | _ | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 10 | F 0 | | Ele | ecti | ves | | | | 2 | #### - N | leans t | here a | re not | enoug | ıh |
| | | | P 0 | | | | | | | | | response | s to k | oe sign | ifican | ıt | |
| | | | I 0 | | Otl | her | | | | 2 | 8 | | | | | | |
| | | | ? 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Title AFROAMER HIST SINCE 18

Instructor: SCOTT, MICHELLE

Enrollment: 45
Questionnaires: 34

0

Grad.

3.50-4.00

3

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 973 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | Questions | | NR | NA | Fr 1 | eque | ncie: | s 4 | 5 | Ins Mean | tructor Rank | Course Mean | Dept Mean | | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|--|---------------------|----------|--------|---------|-------|--------|--------|----|-------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------------|--------|---------------|--------------|
| | | General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did yo | u gain n | ew insights,skills fr | om this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 29 | 4.82 | 256/1649 | 4.82 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.27 | 4.82 |
| _ | _ | ctor make clear the ϵ | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 29 | 4.85 | 182/1648 | 4.85 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.85 |
| | | uestions reflect the | = | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 30 | 4.88 | 179/1375 | 4.88 | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.22 | 4.88 |
| 4. Did ot | her eval | uations reflect the ϵ | expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 22 | 4.69 | 301/1595 | 4.69 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.21 | 4.69 |
| 5. Did as | signed r | eadings contribute to | what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 24 | 4.48 | 388/1533 | 4.48 | 4.27 | 4.04 | 4.05 | 4.48 |
| 6. Did wr | ritten as | signments contribute | to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 23 | 4.66 | 271/1512 | 4.66 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.66 |
| 7. Was th | e gradin | g system clearly expl | ained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 26 | 4.79 | 189/1623 | 4.79 | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.08 | 4.79 |
| 8. How ma | ny times | was class cancelled | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 26 | 4.79 | 865/1646 | 4.79 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.67 | 4.79 |
| 9. How wo | ould you | grade the overall tea | ching effectiveness | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 22 | 4.75 | 165/1621 | 4.75 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.02 | 4.75 |
| | | Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were t | he instr | uctor's lectures well | prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 31 | 4.94 | 171/1568 | 4.94 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.94 |
| 2. Did th | e instru | ctor seem interested | in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 31 | 4.94 | 414/1572 | 4.94 | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.64 | 4.94 |
| | | terial presented and | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 30 | 4.91 | 169/1564 | 4.91 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.25 | 4.91 |
| | | es contribute to what | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 29 | 4.88 | 238/1559 | 4.88 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.23 | 4.88 |
| 5. Did au | diovisua | l techniques enhance | your understanding | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 27 | 4.82 | 129/1352 | 4.82 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.97 | 4.82 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | ussions contribute to | _ | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 22 | 4.57 | 400/1384 | 4.57 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.11 | 4.57 |
| | | nts actively encourag | | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 28 | 4.93 | | 4.93 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.37 | 4.93 |
| | | ctor encourage fair a | and open discussion | 4 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 29 | 4.97 | 106/1368 | 4.97 | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.39 | 4.97 |
| 4. Were s | ere special techniques successful | | | | 6 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 13 | 4.21 | 361/ 948 | 4.21 | 3.86 | 3.95 | 4.00 | 4.21 |
| _ | | Laboratory | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | |
| | | ded with adequate bac | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 243 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 3.89 | **** |
| 5. Were r | requireme | nts for lab reports o | clearly specified | 26 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | ****/ 555 | **** | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.22 | **** |
| 4 54 | | Seminar | | 2.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | F 00 | ****/ 00 | | 2 02 | 4 25 | 1 16 | |
| _ | | ons contribute to wha for grading made clea | _ | 33 31 | 0 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 0 1 | 1 | | ****/ 92 ****/ 288 | **** | 3.93 3.81 | 4.35 | 4.46 3.58 | **** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Did fi | old ormo | Field Work rience contribute to | what was laamad | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | E 00 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 3.59 | **** |
| | _ | y understand your eva | _ | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.09 | 4.21 | **** |
| _ | | ctor available for co | | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.43 | **** |
| | | could you discuss yo | | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.38 | 4.32 | **** |
| | _ | s help you carry out | | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | | ****/ 312 | **** | 4.00 | 3.68 | 3.60 | **** |
| | | Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did se | elf-paced | system contribute to | what you learned | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | 5.00 | 4.30 | 4.32 | **** |
| | _ | tions make clear the | _ | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 30 | **** | 4.00 | 4.16 | 4.44 | **** |
| | | ugh proctors for all | _ | 26 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | | ****/ 110 | **** | 4.24 | 3.99 | 4.05 | **** |
| | | Frequ | ıency | Dis | trib | utio | n | | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits E | arned | Expected Grades | | | | Re | ason | 5 | | | Tyj | pe | | | Majors | ; | |
| 00 27 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | |
| 00-27 28-55 | 1 0 | A 13 B 17 | | ке | quir | ea I | or Ma | ajor | ä | 4 | Graduat | E | U | Majo |)T | 18 | |
| 56-83 | 7 | 1.00-1.99 0 2.00-2.99 1 | C 1 | | Cer | nera | 1 | | | 1 | .5 | Under-g | rad 3 | 34 | Non- | -major | 16 |
| 84-150 | 7 | 3.00-3.49 5 | D 0 | | Gel | ı.cı a | | | | 1 | | onder -g. | Lau 3 | , 1 | 14011- | ila JUI | Τ0 |
| 84-150 | , | 3.00-3.49 5 | Д 0 | | | | | | | | | | | .1 | | | _ |

Electives

2

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

F

0

I 0 Other 12

Course-Section: HIST 355A 0101

Title AM INTELLIGENCE REV-9/

Instructor: LAURIE, CLAYTON

Enrollment: 65
Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 974 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

| | | Questions | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
|-------------|-----------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------|------|-------------------|------|------|--------|------|----------|-----------|---------|--------|---------|------------|-------|
| | | General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you | gain new | | s from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 5.00 | 1/1649 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.27 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the | instruct | or make clear t | he expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 36 | 4.95 | 89/1648 | 4.95 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.95 |
| 3. Did the | exam que | estions reflect | the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 37 | 4.97 | 50/1375 | 4.97 | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.22 | 4.97 |
| 4. Did othe | er evalua | ations reflect t | he expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 31 | 4.86 | 156/1595 | 4.86 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.21 | 4.86 |
| 5. Did assi | igned rea | dings contribut | e to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 34 | 4.82 | 146/1533 | 4.82 | 4.27 | 4.04 | 4.05 | 4.82 |
| 6. Did writ | ten assi | gnments contrib | ute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 34 | 4.89 | 114/1512 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.89 |
| 7. Was the | grading | system clearly | explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 37 | 4.97 | 37/1623 | 4.97 | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.08 | 4.97 |
| 8. How many | / times w | as class cancel | led | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 6 | 4.16 | 1469/1646 | 4.16 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.67 | 4.16 |
| 9. How woul | ld you gr | ade the overall | teaching effectiveness | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 29 | 4.94 | 66/1621 | 4.94 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.02 | 4.94 |
| | | Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the | e instruc | tor's lectures | well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 34 | 4.89 | 259/1568 | 4.89 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.89 |
| | | | ted in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | | 1/1572 | 5.00 | | 4.70 | 4.64 | |
| | | | and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 32 | | 253/1564 | 4.81 | | 4.28 | | 4.81 |
| | | | what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | | 123/1559 | | 4.48 | | 4.23 | |
| | | | nce your understanding | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | | | 182/1352 | | | | 3.97 | |
| J. Did addi | IOVIDUAL | nee your understanding | _ | Ü | Ü | Ü | _ | | 2, | 1.70 | 102/1332 | 1.70 | 1.07 | 3.70 | 3.77 | 11,70 | |
| 1 54 | | Discussi | | 1.0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1.0 | 4 50 | 427/1204 | 4 50 | 4 10 | 4 00 | 4 11 | 4 50 |
| | | | e to what you learned | 16 | 0 | 1 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | | 4.50 | | | | 4.08 | 4.11 | |
| | | | uraged to participate | 16 | 0 | | - | - | 2 | | 4.73 | | | | 4.29 | | 4.73 |
| | | | ir and open discussion | 16 | 0 | 1 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 1 | | | 461/1368 | | | 4.30 | 4.39 | |
| 4. Were spe | ecial tec | chniques success | Iul | 16 | 15 | 2 | U | Ü | 1 | 4 | 3.71 | ****/ 948 | **** | 3.86 | 3.95 | 4.00 | **** |
| | | Laborato | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were req | quirement | s for lab repor | ts clearly specified | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 5.00 | 1/ 555 | 5.00 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.22 | 5.00 |
| | | Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were cri | iteria fo | or grading made | clear | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | ****/ 288 | **** | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.58 | **** |
| | | Field Wo | rk | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Did conf | erences | help you carry | out field activities | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 312 | *** | 4.00 | 3.68 | 3.60 | *** |
| | | Self Pa | ced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were the | ere enoug | | all the students | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 110 | **** | 4.24 | 3.99 | 4.05 | *** |
| | | | Frequ | iency | Dis | trib | utio | n | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Ear | rned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | | | | Rea | ason | s | | | Тур | e | | | Majors | ; |
| 00-27 | 1 | 0 A 19 | | Re | quir | ed f | or M | ajor | `s | 5 | Graduate | 9 | 0 | Majo | or | 19 | |
| 28-55 | 3 | 0 B 13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 10 | 5 C 1 | | Ge | nera | 1 | | | 1 | 2 | Under-gr | rad 3 | 88 | Non- | -major | 19 | |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3 D 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 F 0 | | El | ecti [.] | ves | | | | 3 | #### - N | | | | _ | ıh |
| | | | P 0 | | 0 | ı | | | | - | _ | response | es to b | e sign | ııııcar | 1T | |
| | | | I 0 | | Ut. | her | | | | 1 | .6 | | | | | | |
| | | | : 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: HIST 355B 0101 University of Maryland Title NATIVE AMERICANS Baltimore County

Title NATIVE AMERICANS Baltimore Count Instructor: BOUTON, TERRY Fall 2008

Enrollment: 34
Questionnaires: 25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 975 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

| Questions | NR | NA | Fre | equer 2 | ncies 3 | 3 4 | 5 | Inst Mean | tructor Rank | Course Mean | _ | UMBC Mean | | Sect Mean |
|---|----|----|-----|------------|------------|--------|----|--------------|-----------------|----------------|------|--------------|------|--------------|
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 19 | 4.68 | 421/1649 | 4.68 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.27 | 4.68 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 4.44 | , | 4.44 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.44 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 18 | 4.72 | 347/1375 | 4.72 | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.22 | 4.72 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 8 | 4.14 | 956/1595 | 4.14 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.21 | 4.14 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 12 | 4.16 | 703/1533 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 4.04 | 4.05 | 4.16 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 12 | 4.20 | 755/1512 | 4.20 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.20 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 14 | 4.36 | 683/1623 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.08 | 4.36 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 14 | 4.58 | 1121/1646 | 4.58 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.67 | 4.58 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 15 | 4.64 | 261/1621 | 4.64 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.02 | 4.64 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 22 | 4.80 | 387/1568 | 4.80 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.80 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 23 | 4.92 | 473/1572 | 4.92 | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.64 | 4.92 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 22 | 4.88 | 187/1564 | | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.25 | 4.88 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 22 | 4.88 | 227/1559 | 4.88 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.23 | 4.88 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 16 | 4.60 | 247/1352 | 4.60 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.97 | 4.60 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 9 | 4.05 | 781/1384 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.11 | 4.05 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 10 | 4.24 | 844/1382 | 4.24 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.37 | 4.24 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 12 | 4.52 | 639/1368 | 4.52 | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.39 | 4.52 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 12 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3.33 | 776/ 948 | 3.33 | 3.86 | 3.95 | 4.00 | 3.33 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 22 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 221 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.07 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | ****/ 243 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 3.89 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 212 | **** | **** | 4.40 | 4.21 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 209 | **** | **** | 4.35 | 4.12 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 19 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | ****/ 555 | **** | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.22 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | ****/ 88 | **** | 4.45 | 4.54 | 4.63 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 22 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.67 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.06 | 4.47 | 4.55 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 22 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | ****/ 81 | **** | 4.38 | 4.43 | 4.30 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | ****/ 92 | **** | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.46 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 20 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | ****/ 288 | **** | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.58 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 3.59 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.09 | 4.21 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.43 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.38 | 4.32 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 4.17 | ****/ 312 | **** | 4.00 | 3.68 | 3.60 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | | ****/ 53 | **** | 5.00 | 4.30 | 4.32 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/ 30 | **** | 4.00 | 4.16 | 4.44 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | | ****/ 41 | **** | 5.00 | 4.43 | 5.00 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 22 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1.00 | | **** | 4.00 | 4.42 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 18 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 110 | **** | 4.24 | 3.99 | 4.05 | *** |

Course-Section: HIST 355B 0101
Title NATIVE AMERICANS
Instructor: BOUTON, TERRY

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 975 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 34
Questionnaires: 25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Credits E | Earned | Cum. GPA | | Expecte | d Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|-----------|--------|-----------|---|---------|----------|---------------------|---|--------------|--------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 4 | Required for Majors | 2 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 17 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 14 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 2 | General | 9 | Under-grad | 25 | Non-major | 8 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | h |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 9 | - | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: HIST 355C 8620 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 976

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Title FAMOUS AMERICAN TRIALS Fall 2008 Instructor: NOLAN, ANDREW

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 14 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | Questions | | | NR | NA | Fre | _ | ncies 3 | 4 | 5 | Inst Mean | ructor Rank | | Dept Mean | | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|------------|------------|--------------------|------------|-----------------|-------|--------|-------|-------|------------|--------|----|--------------|----------------|---------|--------------|--------|---------------|--------------|
| 1 Did vo | | General General | | oia gourgo | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 4.93 | 149/1649 | 4.93 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.27 | 4.93 |
| | | tor make clear | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1648 | | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 5.00 |
| | | estions reflect | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1375 | 5.00 | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.22 | 5.00 |
| | | ations reflect | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1595 | 5.00 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.21 | 5.00 |
| | | adings contribu | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 4.86 | 128/1533 | 4.86 | 4.27 | 4.04 | 4.05 | 4.86 |
| | | ignments contri | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 4.86 | 133/1512 | 4.86 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.86 |
| 7. Was the | e grading | system clearly | explained | · · | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 4.79 | 189/1623 | 4.79 | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.08 | 4.79 |
| 8. How man | ny times v | was class cance | lled | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1646 | 5.00 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.67 | 5.00 |
| 9. How wo | uld you g | rade the overal | l teaching | g effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 4.92 | 84/1621 | 4.92 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.02 | 4.92 |
| | | Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | ctor's lectures | | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1568 | | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 5.00 |
| | | tor seem intere | | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1572 | | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.64 | 5.00 |
| | | erial presented | _ | - | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1564 | | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.25 | 5.00 |
| | | s contribute to | | | 2 | 0 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 1 | 0 2 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1559 | 5.00 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.23 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did au | alovisual | techniques enh | ance your | understanding | 4 | 1 | U | U | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4.56 | 275/1352 | 4.56 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.97 | 4.56 |
| | | Discuss | ion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did cla | ass discus | ssions contribu | te to what | you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1384 | 5.00 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.11 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were a | ll student | ts actively enc | ouraged to | participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1382 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.37 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the | e instruc | tor encourage f | air and or | en discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1368 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.39 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were s | pecial te | chniques succes | sful | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 4.85 | 98/ 948 | 4.85 | 3.86 | 3.95 | 4.00 | 4.85 |
| | | Laborat | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were r | equirement | ts for lab repo | rts clearl | y specified | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/ 555 | 5.00 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.22 | 5.00 |
| _ | | Seminar | | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were c | riteria fo | or grading made | clear | | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 288 | **** | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.58 | **** |
| F Did | | Field W | | | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | _ | 1 | 1 11 | 60 / 210 | 1 1 1 | 4 00 | 2 60 | 2 60 | 4 14 |
| 5. Dia co | nierences | help you carry | out fleid | activities | / | 0 | 0 | U | 0 | 6 | 1 | 4.14 | 62/ 312 | 4.14 | 4.00 | 3.68 | 3.60 | 4.14 |
| | | | | Frequ | ıency | 7 Dist | tribu | ution | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | E | Expected Grades | | | | Rea | asons | 5 | | | Ту | pe | | | Majors | } |
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 8 | | Red | quire | ed fo | or Ma | jor | s | 1 | Graduat | e | 0 | Majo | r r | 3 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C 1 | | Gei | neral | 1 | | | | 5 | Under-g | rad 1 | .4 | Non- | major | 11 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F 0 | | Ele | ectiv | ves | | | | 0 | #### - 1 | | | | _ | ſh |
| | | | | P 0 | | | | | | | | _ | respons | es to b | e sign | ifican | ıt | |
| | | | | I 0 | | Otl | ner | | | | | 7 | | | | | | |
| | | | | ? 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: HIST 374 0101

Title EURO WOMENS HIST TO 17

Instructor: FROIDE, AMY

Enrollment: 44
Questionnaires: 29

Fall 2008

Page 977 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

| | | Question | s | | NR | NA | Fro | equei 2 | ncie 3 | s 4 | 5 | | tructor Rank | Course Mean | _ | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|------------|--|------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------|------|-------------------|------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------------|----------------|------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| | | Genera | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you | u gain n | ew insights,ski | | om this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 21 | 4.66 | 446/1649 | 4.66 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.27 | 4.66 |
| | | ctor make clear | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 17 | 4.45 | 643/1648 | 4.45 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.45 |
| | | uestions reflec | | | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | ****/1375 | *** | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.22 | *** |
| 4. Did oth | her eval | uations reflect | the ex | spected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 17 | 4.41 | 622/1595 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.21 | 4.41 |
| 5. Did ass | signed r | eadings contrib | ute to | what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 22 | 4.68 | 233/1533 | 4.68 | 4.27 | 4.04 | 4.05 | 4.68 |
| 5. Did wr | itten as | signments contr | ibute t | to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 21 | 4.59 | 317/1512 | 4.59 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.59 |
| 7. Was the | e gradin | g system clearl | y expla | ained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 12 | 14 | 4.36 | 696/1623 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.08 | 4.36 |
| | | was class canc | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 24 | 4.86 | 748/1646 | 4.86 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.67 | 4.86 |
| 9. How wor | uld you | grade the overa | ll tead | ching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 13 | 4.48 | 401/1621 | 4.48 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.02 | 4.48 |
| | | Lectur | е | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were th | he instr | prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 22 | 4.72 | 535/1568 | 4.72 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.72 | | |
| 2. Did the | e instru | in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 5.00 | 1/1572 | 5.00 | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.64 | 5.00 | | |
| 3. Was led | cture ma | terial presente | explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 23 | 4.79 | 278/1564 | 4.79 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.25 | 4.79 | |
| 4. Did the | e lectur | you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 22 | 4.66 | 524/1559 | 4.66 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.23 | 4.66 | | |
| Did aud | audiovisual techniques enhance your understand | | | | | 5 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 4.00 | 690/1352 | 4.00 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.97 | 4.0 |
| | | Discus | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| l. Did cla | ass disc | ussions contrib | ute to | what you learned | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 21 | 4.56 | 400/1384 | 4.56 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.11 | 4.56 |
| 2. Were a | ll stude | nts actively en | courage | ed to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 23 | 4.92 | 194/1382 | 4.92 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.37 | 4.92 |
| | | | | nd open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 24 | 4.96 | 106/1368 | 4.96 | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.39 | 4.9 |
| l. Were sp | pecial to | echniques succe | ssful | | 4 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3.11 | 833/ 948 | 3.11 | 3.86 | 3.95 | 4.00 | 3.11 |
| | | Labora | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were re | equireme | nts for lab rep | orts cl | learly specified | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 5.00 | 1/ 555 | 5.00 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.22 | 5.00 |
| | | Semina | r | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | _ | - | | announced theme | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 88 | *** | 4.45 | 4.54 | 4.63 | **** |
| 5. Were c | riteria : | for grading mad | e clear | î. | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 288 | **** | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.58 | **** |
| | | Field | Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Did cor | nference | s help you carr | y out f | field activities | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 312 | **** | 4.00 | 3.68 | 3.60 | **** |
| | | | | Frequ | iency | Dist | trib | utio | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Ea | arned | Expected Grades | | | | Rea | ason | s | | | Ту | pe | | | Majors | ; | | |
| 00-27 | 27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 8 | | | | | | | ed f | or M | aior | | 8 | Graduat | | 0 | Majo | | 9 |
| 28-55 | 6 | B 17 | | 1/6/ | 1411 | cu I | J⊥ I¶ | ۵ کال ما | ۵. | J | Graduat | _ | U | Ma JC |) <u>+</u> | 9 | | |
| 56-83 | 6 | 1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99 | C 1 | | Ger | nera | 1 | | | | 9 | Under-q | rad 2 | 29 | Non- | -major | 20 | |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | 001 | | _ | | | | - | onder 9 | 2 | | 1,011 | | 20 | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 7 6 | F 0 | | Ele | ecti [.] | ves | | | | 0 | #### - 1 | Means t | here a | re not | enous | rh |
| | - | 2.22 2.00 | - | P 0 | | | | | | | | - | respons | | | | | , . |
| | | | | I O | | Otl | ner | | | | | 9 | -1 | | 5- | | | |
| | | | | 2 0 | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: HIST 383 8620 University of Maryland Title JAPAN IN SHOGUN AGE

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: OAKES, JULIE Enrollment: 6

Questionnaires: 6

Page 978 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

| | | Ouestion | | NR | NA | Fre | - | ncies 3 | ; 4 | 5 | Inst Mean | ructor Rank | Course | Dept Mean | | Level Mean | Sect Mean | |
|------------|--|-----------------|---------|---------------------|--------|--------|-------|-------------|--------|--------|--------------|----------------|-----------|--------------|--------|---------------|--------------|------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Genera | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | ew insights,ski | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 274/1649 | 4.80 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.27 | 4.80 |
| | | ctor make clear | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.40 | 702/1648 | 4.40 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.40 |
| | | uestions reflec | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 233/1375 | 4.80 | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.22 | 4.80 |
| | | uations reflect | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1595 | 5.00 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.21 | 5.00 |
| | | | | what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 5.00 | 4.27 | 4.04 | 4.05 | 5.00 |
| | | _ | | o what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 156/1512 | 4.80 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.80 |
| | | g system clearl | | ined | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4.20 | 883/1623 | 4.20 | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.08 | 4.20 |
| | - | was class cand | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | | 1103/1646 | | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.67 | 4.60 |
| 9. How wo | uld you g | grade the overa | ll tead | ching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.00 | 914/1621 | 4.00 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.02 | 4.00 |
| | | Lectur | е | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were t | e the instructor's lectures well prepared | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1568 | 5.00 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the | the instructor seem interested in the subject | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1572 | 5.00 | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.64 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was le | lecture material presented and explained clea | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 263/1564 | 4.80 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.25 | 4.80 |
| 4. Did the | lecture material presented and explained cleathe lectures contribute to what you learned | | | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 390/1559 | 4.75 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.23 | 4.75 |
| 5. Did au | d audiovisual techniques enhance your understand | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 157/1352 | 4.75 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.97 | 4.75 |
| | | Discus | sion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did cla | ass disc | | | what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 541/1384 | 4.40 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.11 | 4.40 |
| | | | | ed to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4.20 | 869/1382 | | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.37 | 4.20 |
| | | - | _ | nd open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1368 | | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.39 | 5.00 |
| | | echniques succe | | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3.80 | 578/ 948 | | 3.86 | 3.95 | | 3.80 |
| | | Labora | tory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were r | equiremer | | _ | early specified | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/ 555 | 5.00 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.22 | 5.00 |
| | | Field | Monle | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Did co | nferences | | | ield activities | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | 68/ 312 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 3.68 | 3.60 | 4.00 |
| | | | | Frequ | encs | 7 Dist | -rib | ıt i oı | n | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | 11040 | .01107 | 210 | | | - | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | | | Rea | asons | \$ | | | Ту | pe | | | Majors | 3 |
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 2 | | Red | quire | ed f | or Ma | jors | 3 | 0 | Graduat | e | 0 | Majo | or | 3 |
| 28-55 | 0 | в 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | C 0 | | Gei | nera: | L | | | | 1 | Under-g | rad | 6 | Non- | major | 3 | | |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 0 | F 0 | | Ele | ectiv | <i>r</i> es | | | | 0 | #### - 1 | Means t | here a | are not | enoug | jh |
| | | | | P 0 | | | | | | | | | respons | es to b | e sign | nifican | nt | |
| | | | | I 0 | | Otl | ner | | | | | 2 | | | | | | |
| | | | | ? 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: HIST 387 0101

Title MED/HEALTH CARE IN CHI

Instructor: YIP, KA-CHE

Enrollment: 45
Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 979 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Quanti an a | NID | 3.7.7 | Fre | equer 2 | | | 5 | | ructor | Course | _ | | Level | |
|---|----------|--------|----------|------------|---|--------|----|------|-----------------------|----------|------|------|-------|-----------|
| Questions | NK | NA | т | | | -4 | | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 18 | 4.33 | 871/1649 | 4.33 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.27 | 4.33 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 5 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 15 | 4.04 | 1106/1648 | 4.04 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.04 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 17 | 4.33 | 733/1375 | 4.33 | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.22 | 4.33 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 6 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 4.19 | 903/1595 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.21 | 4.19 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 14 | 4.24 | 643/1533 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.04 | 4.05 | 4.24 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 7 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 10 | 4.35 | 574/1512 | 4.35 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.35 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 7 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 12 | 4.23 | 849/1623 | 4.23 | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.08 | 4.23 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 5.00 | 1/1646 | 5.00 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.67 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 7 | 4.09 | 864/1621 | 4.09 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.02 | 4.09 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 21 | 4.65 | 652/1568 | 4.65 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.65 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 23 | 4.85 | 740/1572 | 4.85 | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.64 | 4.85 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | | 4.46 | | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.25 | 4.46 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 19 | | 931/1559 | 4.31 | | 4.29 | 4.23 | 4.31 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 6 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 3.32 | 1138/1352 | 3.32 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.97 | 3.32 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 3.84 | 916/1384 | 3.84 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.11 | 3.84 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 13 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 3.95 | 997/1382 | 3.95 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.37 | 3.95 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 13 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 10 | 3.95 | 998/1368 | 3.95 | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.39 | 3.95 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 13 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3.22 | 806/ 948 | | | 3.95 | 4.00 | |
| | | | | | | | | | 011, 111 | | | | | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 243 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 3.89 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 212 | **** | **** | 4.40 | 4.21 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 28 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/ 555 | **** | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.22 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.06 | 4.47 | 4.55 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 288 | **** | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.58 | **** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Field Work | | | • | • | _ | • | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 52 | *** | **** | 4.06 | 3.59 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 31 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 2 | 1 | | ****/ 48 ****/ 312 | **** | **** | 4.09 | 4.21 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 29 | 1 | U | U | U | 2 | U | 4.00 | ^^^/ 312 | | 4.00 | 3.68 | 3.60 | * * * * * |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | 5.00 | 4.30 | 4.32 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 30 | **** | 4.00 | 4.16 | 4.44 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 4.33 | 24/ 110 | 4.33 | 4.24 | 3.99 | 4.05 | 4.33 |
| Fran | 000 | . Dici | - m i h- | .+ | | | | | | | | | | |

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|----------|--------|---------------------|---|--------------|--------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 5 | Required for Majors | 8 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 6 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 7 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 6 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 32 | Non-major | 26 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | h |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sid | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 7 | - | • | - | |

? 0

Course-Section: HIST 443 0101

THE U.S. SINCE 1945

Title Instructor: SMEAD, HOWARD

Enrollment: 45 Fall 2008

Page 980 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

| uestionnaires: 40 Student Course Evaluation | Questionnaire |
|---|---------------|
|---|---------------|

| Questions | NR | NA | Fre | eque 2 | ncie 3 | s 4 | 5 | Ins Mean | tructor Rank | Course Mean | Dept Mean | | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 7 | 0 0 0 3 0 0 0 | 0 1 0 1 2 2 0 0 | 1 1 2 3 2 2 1 0 | 2 6 1 5 7 5 1 0 | 3 8 14 11 7 14 8 18 | 33 23 22 16 21 16 29 20 18 | 4.10 4.03 4.67 | 629/1375 1038/1595 748/1533 | 4.74 4.31 4.44 4.06 4.10 4.03 4.67 4.53 4.45 | 4.46 4.38 4.66 4.28 4.27 4.29 4.38 4.76 4.26 | 4.28 4.23 4.27 4.20 4.04 4.10 4.16 4.69 4.06 | 4.50 4.36 4.48 4.36 4.14 4.26 4.27 4.71 4.24 | 4.74 4.31 4.44 4.06 4.10 4.03 4.67 4.53 4.45 |
| Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 3 3 4 | 0 0 0 0 7 | 0 0 1 1 3 | 2 0 1 0 3 | 0 0 1 1 | 7 3 6 3 5 | 28 34 28 32 7 | 4.65 4.92 4.59 4.76 3.34 | 667/1568 532/1572 560/1564 390/1559 1126/1352 | 4.65 4.92 4.59 4.76 3.34 | 4.54 4.84 4.46 4.48 4.07 | 4.43 4.70 4.28 4.29 3.98 | 4.54 4.79 4.40 4.41 4.07 | |
| Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful | 19 19 19 19 | 0 0 0 17 | 4 1 0 1 | 2 2 1 0 | 4 5 2 0 | 4 2 2 0 | 7 11 16 3 | 3.95 4.57 | 1132/1384 988/1382 601/1368 ****/ 948 | 3.38 3.95 4.57 **** | 4.12 4.36 4.46 3.86 | 4.08 4.29 4.30 3.95 | 4.35 4.56 4.58 4.31 | 3.38 3.95 4.57 **** |
| Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | ****/ 555 | **** | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.41 | **** |
| Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | ****/ 288 | **** | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.71 | **** |
| Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | ****/ 312 | **** | 4.00 | 3.68 | 3.95 | **** |
| Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 4.20 | 26/ 110 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 3.99 | 4.22 | 4.20 |
| Frequ | ency | Dist | tribu | utio | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades | | | | Re | ason | s | | | Ту | pe | | | Majors | } |
| 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 12 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 17 56-83 4 2.00-2.99 8 C 7 | | | quire | | or M | ajor | | 5 6 | Graduat Under-g | | 0 | Majo Non- | or -major | 17 |
| 84-150 16 3.00-3.49 11 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 8 F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 0 | | | ectiv her | ves | | | | 0 | #### - 1 respons | | | | _ | rh |

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Course-Section: HIST 445 0101 University of Maryland Title HISTORY OF SCIENCE

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: TATAREWICZ, JOS

Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 23

| I | age | 981 |
|-----|------|-------|
| FEB | 11, | 2009 |
| Job | IRBI | R3029 |

| Ctudant | ('Ollred | Evaluation | Ollection | naira |
|---------|----------|------------|-----------|-------|
| | | | | |

| | | | | | | Fr | eque: | ncies | \$ | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|-----------|--|---|-----------------------|-----------------|--------|-------------------|--------|--------|--------|--|------------|-----------|---------|--------|--------|--------------|------|
| | | Questions | | NR | NA | 1 | _ | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | _ | | Mean | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 544 | | General | +b: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | _ | 4 | 1 / | 4.39 | 789/1649 | 4.39 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4 50 | 4 20 |
| | | ew insights,skills for ctor make clear the e | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 3 | 4 9 | 8 | | 1218/1648 | | | 4.28 | 4.50 4.36 | 4.39 |
| | | | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 9 | | 936/1375 | | 4.56 | 4.23 | | 4.04 |
| | Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | | | | | | 0 | 3 | 5 | 9 | | 1067/1595 | | 4.28 | 4.27 | | 4.04 |
| | | | | 0 | 4 0 | 2 1 | 2 | 2 | | | | 788/1533 | | 4.27 | 4.04 | | |
| | Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | | | | | 0 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 7 | | 883/1512 | | 4.27 | 4.10 | | 4.00 |
| | old written assignments contribute to what you learned Was the grading system clearly explained | | | | | 0 | 1 | 6 | 9 | 7 | | 1104/1623 | | 4.29 | 4.16 | | |
| | | was class cancelled | lained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | | | 1004/1646 | | 4.76 | 4.69 | | |
| | | rade the overall tea | ahina offoativonoaa | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 8 | | | 1069/1621 | | | | 4.24 | |
| 9. HOW WO | ouiu you g | grade the Overall tea | cilling effectiveness | 3 | 1 | U | | 5 | 0 | 5 | 3.09 | 1009/1021 | 3.09 | 4.20 | 4.00 | 4.24 | 3.03 |
| | | Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were t | he instru | ctor's lectures well | prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 16 | 4.50 | 852/1568 | 4.50 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.54 | 4.50 |
| 2. Did th | ne instruc | tor seem interested | in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 21 | 4.91 | 591/1572 | 4.91 | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 4.91 |
| 3. Was le | ecture mat | erial presented and | explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 10 | 4.09 | 1087/1564 | 4.09 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.40 | 4.09 |
| 4. Did th | ne lecture | es contribute to what | you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 15 | 4.36 | 871/1559 | 4.36 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.41 | 4.36 |
| 5. Did au | diovisual | techniques enhance | your understanding | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 15 | 4.36 | 432/1352 | 4.36 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 4.07 | 4.36 |
| | | - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did cl | 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | | | | | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2.92 | 1295/1384 | 2.92 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.35 | 2.92 |
| 2. Were a | 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | | | | | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3.25 | 1275/1382 | 3.25 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.56 | 3.25 |
| 3. Did th | ne instruc | tor encourage fair a | and open discussion | 11 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 4.00 | 948/1368 | 4.00 | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.58 | 4.00 |
| 4. Were s | special te | chniques successful | | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 948 | **** | 3.86 | 3.95 | 4.31 | **** |
| | | Tabanatan | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E Word r | rogui romon | Laboratory ats for lab reports o | aloarly apogified | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | E 00 | ****/ 555 | **** | 1 00 | 1 20 | 1 11 | **** |
| o. Were i | equiremen | ics for lab reports (| stearry specified | 19 | U | U | U | U | U | 4 | 3.00 | / 555 | | 4.05 | 4.23 | 4.41 | |
| | | Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Did co | nferences | s help you carry out | field activities | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 312 | **** | 4.00 | 3.68 | 3.95 | **** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were t | here enou | igh proctors for all | the students | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 4.17 | 30/ 110 | 4.17 | 4.24 | 3.99 | 4.22 | 4.17 |
| | | | Frequ | onas | , Die | trib | u+ i o | n | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | rrequ | iency | DIS | CLID | ucio. | 11 | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits E | Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | | | | Re | asons | 5 | | | Ту | pe | | | Majors | 3 |
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 1 | A 3 | | | | | or Ma | | | 2 | Graduat | | 0 | Majo | | 9 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 15 | | re(| quii ' | cu I | OT MC | ייטני | b | 4 | Graduat | _ | U | ria J | J. |) |
| 56-83 | 6 | 2.00-2.99 3 | C 2 | General 3 | | | | | | | 3 | Under-q | rad 2 | 3 | Non- | -major | 14 |
| 84-150 | 7 | 3.00-3.49 3 | D 0 | General 5 onder | | | | | | | onder g | Luu Z | 5 | 14011 | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 4 | F 1 | | E1 | ecti [.] | ves | | | | 1 | #### - 1 | Means t | here a | re not | enouc | rh |
| oraa. | J | 3.30 1.00 I | P 0 | | 11.1 | | | | | 1 #### - Means there are responses to be signifi | | | | | | | |
| | | | т 0 | | O+1 | her | | | | 1 | 6 | TCCCOID | | c brgn | LLLCUI | | |
| | | | ? 2 | | 00. | | | | | _ | - | | | | | | |
| | | | • - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Title SOCIAL HIST OF MEDICIN

Instructor: ROTHSTEIN, WILL

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 7

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 982 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Ins | tructor | Course | Dept | UMBC Level | | Sect |
|---|-------|---------------------|-------------|-------|-------|-------|---|------|-----------|--------|------|------------|--------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3.71 | 1396/1649 | 3.71 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.50 | 3.71 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3.71 | 1375/1648 | 3.71 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.36 | 3.71 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4.29 | 780/1375 | 4.29 | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.48 | 4.29 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3.86 | 1231/1595 | 3.86 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 3.86 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4.29 | 594/1533 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.04 | 4.14 | 4.29 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 3.29 | 1363/1512 | 3.29 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.26 | 3.29 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3.57 | 1359/1623 | 3.57 | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 3.57 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4.43 | 1268/1646 | 4.43 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.71 | 4.43 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.80 | 1151/1621 | 3.80 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.24 | 3.80 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | 767/1568 | 4.57 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.54 | 4.57 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 4.43 | 1305/1572 | 4.43 | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 4.43 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 3.86 | 1246/1564 | 3.86 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.40 | 3.86 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.14 | 1045/1559 | 4.14 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.41 | 4.14 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3.83 | 860/1352 | 3.83 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 4.07 | 3.83 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4.17 | 726/1384 | 4.17 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.35 | 4.17 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.17 | 887/1382 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.56 | 4.17 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.00 | 948/1368 | 4.00 | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.58 | 4.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | 917/ 948 | 2.50 | 3.86 | 3.95 | 4.31 | 2.50 |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 312 | *** | 4.00 | 3.68 | 3.95 | **** |
| Freq | uency | / Dis | trib | ution | n | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | & | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades | | | | Rea | asons | 5 | | | Ту: | ре | | | Majors | |
| 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 | | Required for Majors | | | | | | 2 | Graduat | е | 1 | Majo | r | 2 |
| 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | l Grades | Reasons | | Type | Majors | | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|----------|----------|---------------------|-------|--------------|--------|----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 4 | Required for Majors | 2 | Graduate | 1 | Major | 2 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 2 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 1 | General | 5 | Under-grad | 6 | Non-major | 5 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 1 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | Electives | ves 0 | | there | are not enough | ī |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | - | | | |
| | | | | 2 | Ο | | | | | | |

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2008

Page 983

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: HIST 455 0101 Title THE ROMAN REPUBLIC Instructor: PHIN, TIMOTHY J

I

0

1

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 28

41

| | | Ouestion | a | | Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 M | | | | | | 5 | Inst Mean | ructor Rank | Course | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | | Sect Mean |
|--|---|------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|----------|----------|----------|--------------|--------------------------|---------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | Question | 5 | | NR | NA | | | | | | меан | Ralik | | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | Genera | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you | u gain ne | ew insights,ski | - lls fro | m this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 20 | 4.70 | 383/1649 | 4.70 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.50 | 4.70 |
| | | ctor make clear | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 20 | 4.70 | 310/1648 | 4.70 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.36 | 4.70 |
| | | estions reflec | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 21 | 4.74 | 309/1375 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.48 | 4.74 |
| 4. Did oth | her evalı | 2 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4.40 | 636/1595 | 4.40 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.40 | | | |
| 5. Did ass | Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 9 | 17 | 4.65 | 249/1533 | 4.65 | 4.27 | 4.04 | 4.14 | 4.65 |
| 6. Did wri | 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | | | | | | | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.33 | 595/1512 | 4.33 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.26 | 4.33 |
| 7. Was the | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 19 | 4.69 | 284/1623 | 4.69 | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 4.69 | | | | |
| 8. How mar | 8. How many times was class cancelled | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 16 | 10 | 4.38 | 1302/1646 | 4.38 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.71 | 4.38 |
| 9. How wou | 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 11 | 4.46 | 442/1621 | 4.46 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.24 | 4.46 |
| | | <u>.</u> . | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | | Lectur | | | | • | • | 0 | 0 | • | 0.0 | 4 00 | 000/1560 | 4 00 | 4 = 4 | 4 42 | 4 = 4 | 4 00 |
| | | actor's lecture | | | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 22 | 4.92 | 220/1568 | | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.54 | 4.92 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 24 | 4.96 4.72 | 237/1572 | | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 4.96 |
| | | teriai presente es contribute t | | | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 18 22 | 4.72 | 406/1564 227/1559 | | 4.46 4.48 | 4.28 | 4.40 4.41 | 4.72 4.88 |
| | | | | our understanding | 3 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 4 | <i>5</i> | 22 8 | 4.88 | 690/1352 | | 4.48 | 3.98 | 4.41 | |
| 5. Did auc | JIOVISUA. | r techniques en | nance y | our understanding | 3 | 0 | U | ۷ | 4 | 5 | 0 | 4.00 | 090/1352 | 4.00 | 4.07 | 3.90 | 4.07 | 4.00 |
| | | Discus | sion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did cla | ass discu | assions contrib | ute to | what you learned | 18 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3.70 | 993/1384 | 3.70 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.35 | 3.70 |
| | | | | d to participate | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 4.22 | 851/1382 | 4.22 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.56 | 4.22 |
| | | | | d open discussion | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 4.44 | 712/1368 | 4.44 | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.58 | 4.44 |
| 4. Were sp | pecial te | echniques succe | ssful | - | 19 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 948 | **** | 3.86 | 3.95 | 4.31 | *** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Frequ | lency | Dist | tribu | ıtior | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | | | Rea | son | s | | | Ту | pe | | | Majors | ; |
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 13 | | Rec | quire | | าะ M | aior | | 1 | Graduat | e | 0 | Majo | | 16 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 5 | | 1000 | 2411 | | ,_ 1·1 | ۱۳۰۱ م | ~ | - | Gradact | _ | • | 1100 | - | |
| 56-83 | 6 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C 5 | | Ger | neral | L | | | | 2 | Under-g | rad 2 | 8 | Non- | major | 12 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D 0 | | | | | | | | | 511451 5144 10 11011 may | | | | 3 | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 8 | F 0 | | Ele | ectiv | <i>r</i> es | | | | 2 | #### - 1 | Means t | here a | re not | enoug | ıh |
| | | | | P 0 | | 210001.02 | | | | | | | respons | es to b | e sign | ifican | ıt | |

Other

18

Course-Section: HIST 462 0101 University of Maryland Title MEDIEVAL EUROPE Baltimore County Instructor:

MCDONOUGH, SUSA

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 36 Fall 2008

Page 984

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | Frequencies | | Instructor | | Course | Dept. | UMBC | Level | Sect | | | |
|---|----------|----|-------------|---|------------|----|--------|-------|-----------|-------|-------|------|--------------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 14 | 4.23 | 986/1649 | 4.23 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.50 | 4.23 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 17 | 4.53 | 521/1648 | 4.53 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.36 | 4.53 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 6 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | | ****/1375 | **** | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.48 | **** |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 16 | 4.21 | 877/1595 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.21 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 17 | 4.33 | 545/1533 | 4.33 | 4.27 | 4.04 | 4.14 | 4.33 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 18 | 4.50 | 380/1512 | 4.50 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.26 | 4.50 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 19 | 4.55 | 448/1623 | 4.55 | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 4.55 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 21 | 4.72 | 961/1646 | 4.72 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.71 | 4.72 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 13 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 13 | 6 | 3.96 | 987/1621 | 3.96 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.24 | 3.96 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 20 | 4.60 | 731/1568 | 4.60 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.54 | 4.60 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 27 | 4.90 | 591/1572 | 4.90 | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 4.90 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 20 | 4.50 | 651/1564 | | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.40 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 20 | 4.47 | 749/1559 | 4.47 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.41 | 4.47 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 6 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 12 | 7 | 3.76 | 914/1352 | 3.76 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 4.07 | 3.76 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 8 | 4.00 | 795/1384 | | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.35 | 4.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 17 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 4.21 | 857/1382 | 4.21 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.56 | 4.21 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 17 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 4.42 | 732/1368 | 4.42 | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.58 | 4.42 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 17 | 11 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2.75 | ****/ 948 | *** | 3.86 | 3.95 | 4.31 | *** |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 00 | ****/ 221 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.73 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 243 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 4.61 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 212 | **** | **** | 4.40 | 4.57 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 209 | **** | **** | 4.35 | 4.63 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 31 | 4.97 | 91/ 555 | 4.97 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.41 | 4.97 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 88 | **** | 4.45 | 4.54 | 4.66 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.06 | 4.47 | 4.54 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 81 | **** | 4.38 | 4.43 | 4.57 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 92 | **** | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.44 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 288 | **** | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.71 | *** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 00 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 1 06 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 48 | *** | **** | 4.09 | 4.86 4.42 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 34 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.42 | **** |
| | 34 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.52 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 34 29 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | | ****/ 312 | **** | | | 3.95 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | ۷3 | Т | U | U | U | ۷ | 4 | 4.0/ | / 312 | | 4.00 | 3.68 | 3.75 | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | 5.00 | 4.30 | 4.64 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 30 | **** | 4.00 | 4.16 | 4.24 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 41 | **** | 5.00 | 4.43 | 4.84 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 24 | **** | 4.00 | 4.42 | 4.85 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | | ****/ 110 | **** | 4.24 | 3.99 | 4.22 | **** |
| | | - | - | | - | - | _ | 5 | , ==0 | | . = - | | | |

Course-Section: HIST 462 0101
Title MEDIEVAL EUROPE
Instructor: MCDONOUGH, SUSA
Enrollment: 39

Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 984 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits E | Tarned | Cum. GPA | | Expecte | ed Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | Majors | |
|-----------|--------|-----------|---|---------|-----------|---------------------|----|--------------|-------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 10 | Required for Majors | 4 | Graduate | 2 | Major | 15 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 14 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 4 | General | 7 | Under-grad | 34 | Non-major | 21 |
| 84-150 | 10 | 3.00-3.49 | 6 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 2 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 | Electives | 2 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | h |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be si | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 15 | - | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: HIST 466 0101
Title THE REFORMATION

Questions

Instructor: GRUBB, JAMES S

Enrollment: 48
Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 985 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

| | | Genera | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|-----------|---------------------------|----------|--------------------|--------|-----|------|-------|------|----------|----|------|---------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|--------|------|
| 1. Did you | u gain ne | ew insights,ski | | this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 21 | 4.83 | 247/ | 1649 | 4.83 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.50 | 4.83 |
| 2. Did the | e instru | ctor make clear | the exp | ected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 18 | 4.71 | 310/ | 1648 | 4.71 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.36 | 4.71 |
| | _ | uestions reflec | | _ | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | | 4.78 | | | | | | 4.48 | 4.78 |
| | | uations reflect | | | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | | 4.59 | | | 4.59 | 4.28 | | | 4.59 |
| | | | | hat you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 4.79 | | | | | | 4.14 | |
| | | | | what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | | | 4.50 | | | 4.50 | | | | |
| | | g system clearl | | .ned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | | 4.50 | , | | | 4.38 | | 4.27 | |
| | | was class cand | | | 1 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 5 | 23 | | 332/ | | | | | 4.71 | |
| 9. HOW WOL | uia you g | grade the overa | il teacr | ning effectiveness | 4 | U | U | U | U | 5 | Τ6 | 4./6 | 159/ | 1021 | 4.76 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.24 | 4./6 |
| | | Lectur | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | uctor's lecture | | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | | 4.65 | | | | | 4.43 | | |
| | | ctor seem inter | | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | | | 1572 | 5.00 | | | 4.79 | |
| | | | | plained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | | 4.61 | | | | 4.46 | | 4.40 | |
| | | es contribute t | | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | 4.91 | | | | 4.48 | | 4.41 | |
| 5. Did aud | diovisua. | l techniques en | hance yo | our understanding | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 13 | 4.36 | 432/ | 1352 | 4.36 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 4.07 | 4.36 |
| | | Discus | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | hat you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 4.83 | | | | 4.12 | | | 4.83 |
| | | | | l to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 4.94 | | | | | 4.29 | | |
| | | | | l open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 4.94 | | | | | 4.30 | | |
| 4. Were sp | pecial te | echniques succe | ssful | | 8 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4.14 | 389/ | 948 | 4.14 | 3.86 | 3.95 | 4.31 | 4.14 |
| 5. Were re | eguireme | Labora nts for lab rep | | early specified | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/ | 555 | 5.00 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.41 | 5.00 |
| | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were co | riteria : | Semina for grading mad | | | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ | 288 | **** | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.71 | **** |
| | | Field | Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Did con | nference | s help you carr | | eld activities | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 4.29 | 46/ | 312 | 4.29 | 4.00 | 3.68 | 3.95 | 4.29 |
| | | Self | Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were th | here eno | ugh proctors fo | r all th | ne students | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 4.00 | 40/ | 110 | 4.00 | 4.24 | 3.99 | 4.22 | 4.00 |
| | | | | Frequ | iency | Dis | trib | utio | n | | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | • | Expected Grades | | | | Rea | ason | s | | | | Тур | oe e | | | Majors | 5 |
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 2 | A 8 | | Re | quir | ed fo | or M | ajor | | 2 | Gra | duate | | 2 | Majo | or | 18 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | в 11 | | | _ | | | - | | | | | | | 3 - | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C 0 | | Ger | nera | 1 | | | | 4 | Und | er-gı | rad 2 | 23 | Non- | -major | 7 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 2 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F 0 | | Ele | ecti | ves | | | | 2 | | | | | are not | | gh |
| | | | | P 0 | | | | | | | | | res | ponse | es to b | oe sign | nifican | nt | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | I 0 ? 2 | | Ot. | her | | | | 1 | . 4 | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: HIST 471 0101 Title

BRITAIN: 1714-1848

Instructor: FROIDE, AMY

Enrollment: 37 Questionnaires: 24 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 986 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

| | | Question | 5 | | NR | NA | Fre | equer 2 | ncie 3 | s 4 | 5 | Inst Mean | ructor Rank | Course Mean | Dept Mean | | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|------------|------------|-------------------------|----------|-------------------|-------|------|-------|------------|-----------|--------|----------|--------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------|---------------|--------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Did 1101 | . goin nou | Genera insights,ski | _ | this source | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 9 | 4.30 | 912/1649 | 4.30 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.50 | 4.30 |
| - | _ | or make clear | | | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 11 | 4.50 | 556/1648 | 4.50 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.36 | 4.50 |
| | | stions reflec | | | 5 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 4.33 | 733/1375 | 4.33 | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.48 | 4.33 |
| | _ | tions reflect | | _ | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 9 | 4.40 | 636/1595 | 4.40 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.40 |
| | | | | hat you learned | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | | 4.39 | 495/1533 | 4.39 | 4.27 | 4.04 | 4.14 | 4.39 |
| | _ | - | | what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 10 | 4.45 | 465/1512 | 4.45 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.26 | 4.45 |
| 7. Was the | e grading | system clearly | y explai | ned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 14 | 4.60 | 395/1623 | 4.60 | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 4.60 |
| 8. How mar | ny times w | as class canc | elled | | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 12 | 4.60 | 1103/1646 | 4.60 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.71 | 4.60 |
| 9. How wor | ıld you gr | ade the overa | ll teach | ing effectiveness | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 6 | 4.38 | 547/1621 | 4.38 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.24 | 4.38 |
| | | Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | tor's lecture | _ | - | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | 4.90 | 245/1568 | 4.90 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.54 | 4.90 |
| | | or seem inter | | _ | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 4.95 | 355/1572 | 4.95 | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 4.95 |
| | | | | plained clearly | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 4.95 | 101/1564 | 4.95 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.40 | 4.95 |
| | | contribute to | | | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 9 | 15 10 | 4.70 | 475/1559 | 4.70 4.45 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.41 | 4.70 4.45 |
| 5. Did aud | ilovisuai | techniques en | nance yo | ur understanding | 4 | U | U | U | 1 | 9 | 10 | 4.45 | 360/1352 | 4.45 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 4.07 | 4.45 |
| | | Discus | sion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | hat you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 4.25 | 673/1384 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.35 | 4.25 |
| | | | | to participate | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 13 | 4.75 | 394/1382 | 4.75 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.56 | 4.75 |
| | | | | open discussion | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 5.00 | 1/1368 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.58 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were sp | pecial tec | hniques succe | ssful | | 8 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 3.80 | 578/ 948 | 3.80 | 3.86 | 3.95 | 4.31 | 3.80 |
| | | Labora | tory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were re | equirement | s for lab rep | orts cle | arly specified | 18 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3.50 | 470/ 555 | 3.50 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.41 | 3.50 |
| | | Semina | r | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were c | riteria fo | r grading made | e clear | | 14 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2.70 | 249/ 288 | 2.70 | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.71 | 2.70 |
| | | Field | Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Did cor | nferences | | | eld activities | 16 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2.14 | 290/ 312 | 2.14 | 4.00 | 3.68 | 3.95 | 2.14 |
| | | 0-1- | D | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were th | nere enoug | Self : h proctors fo | | e students | 22 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 110 | **** | 4.24 | 3.99 | 4.22 | *** |
| | | | | Frequ | encv | Dist | trib | ıtior | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | _ | cricy | DIS | CIID | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | | | Rea | ason | s | | | Туј | pe | | | Majors | |
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A 8 | | Red | quire | ed fo | or M | ajor | s | 1 | Graduate | e | 0 | Majo | or | 11 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В 12 | | | | _ | | | | | _ | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 6 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C 0 | | Ger | neral | L | | | | 0 | Under-g | rad 2 | 14 | Non- | major | 13 |
| 84-150 | 8 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D 0 | | | | | | | | 1 | | | , | | | , |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F 0 | | Ele | ectiv | ves | | | | 1 | #### - 1 | | | | _ | n |
| | | | | P 0 | | O+1 | h o | | | | - | 7 | response | es to b | e sign | ııııcar | 1C | |
| | | | | 5 0 I 0 | | Uti | her | | | | 1 | .7 | | | | | | |
| | | | | : 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: HIST 477 0101

Title HISTORY OF CHINA TO 16

YIP, KA-CHE

Instructor: Enrollment:

41 Questionnaires: 20

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 987 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

| ~ | | | | | | ~ | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|---|----|------|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|------|--------|-----------------|
| | | | | | Fr | eque | ncie | S | | Inst | tructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
| | Questions | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Did you gain new | insights,skills from | this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 17 | 4.80 | 274/1649 | 4.80 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.50 | 4.80 |
| | or make clear the exp | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 10 | 4.40 | 702/1648 | | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.36 | 4.40 |
| | stions reflect the ex | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 15 | 4.60 | 464/1375 | 4.60 | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.48 | 4.60 |
| | tions reflect the exp | | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 4.36 | 697/1595 | | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.36 |
| | dings contribute to w | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 4.30 | 575/1533 | | 4.27 | 4.04 | 4.14 | 4.30 |
| _ | _ | - | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.60 | 310/1512 | | | | 4.26 | 4.60 |
| | gnments contribute to | - | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 14 | | , - | | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.25 | 4.60 |
| | system clearly explai | .nea | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 4.60 | 395/1623 | | 4.38 | 4.16 | | |
| 8. How many times w | | | | | 0 | | | - | 19 | 5.00 | 1/1646 | | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.71 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you gr | ade the overall teach | ing effectiveness | 4 | 0 | U | 0 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 4.19 | 766/1621 | 4.19 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.24 | 4.19 |
| | Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instruc | tor's lectures well p | repared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 4.74 | 517/1568 | 4.74 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.54 | 4.74 |
| 2. Did the instruct | or seem interested in | the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 17 | 4.84 | 740/1572 | 4.84 | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 4.84 |
| 3. Was lecture mate | rial presented and ex | plained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 14 | 4.58 | 580/1564 | 4.58 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.40 | 4.58 |
| 4. Did the lectures | contribute to what y | ou learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 4.68 | 487/1559 | 4.68 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.41 | 4.68 |
| 5. Did audiovisual | techniques enhance yo | ur understanding | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 3.88 | 830/1352 | 3.88 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 4.07 | 3.88 |
| | Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Did alama diama | | Jan] | _ | 0 | 1 | 1 | -1 | 2 | 0 | 4 01 | 607/1204 | 4 01 | 4 10 | 4 00 | 4 25 | 4 01 |
| | sions contribute to w | | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 2 | 2 | 9 | 4.21 | 697/1384 | | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.35 | 4.21 |
| | s actively encouraged | | 6 | - | _ | - | | 3 | 8 | 4.21 | 857/1382 | | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.56 | 4.21 |
| | or encourage fair and | open discussion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 4.50 | 654/1368 | | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.58 | 4.50 |
| 4. Were special tec | nniques successiul | | 6 | 11 | 0 | U | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 948 | *** | 3.86 | 3.95 | 4.31 | **** |
| | Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provide | d with adequate backg | round information | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 243 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 4.61 | **** |
| 5. Were requirement | s for lab reports cle | arly specified | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 5.00 | 1/ 555 | 5.00 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.41 | 5.00 |
| | Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were criteria fo | r grading made clear | | 17 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 288 | **** | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.71 | *** |
| | mi alia masala | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 5'1 6' 11 | Field Work | | 1.0 | 0 | _ | • | • | - | - | 4 50 | **** | ate ate ate ate | ate ate ate ate | 1 06 | 1 00 | ate ate ate ate |
| | ence contribute to wh | | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Τ | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 52 | | | 4.06 | 4.86 | |
| | understand your evalu | | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.09 | 4.42 | **** |
| | or available for cons | | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.52 | **** |
| _ | ould you discuss your | | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.38 | 4.59 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences | help you carry out fi | eld activities | 16 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 312 | **** | 4.00 | 3.68 | 3.95 | **** |
| | Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced s | ystem contribute to w | hat you learned | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 53 | **** | 5.00 | 4.30 | 4.64 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough | h proctors for all th | e students | 17 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 110 | **** | 4.24 | 3.99 | 4.22 | **** |
| | | Frequ | iency | 7 Dist | trib | utio | n | | | | | | | | | |
| - 11 | <u> </u> | _ | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | | | | Re | ason | 3 | | | Ty | pe | | | Majors | 3 |

| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | l Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|------------|-------|-----------|---|----------|----------|---------------------|----|--------------|--------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | А | 3 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 15 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | В | 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 5 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 20 | Non-major | 5 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | n |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | nificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 16 | _ | | | |
| | | | | 2 | 1 | | | | | | |

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

Page 988

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 18 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: HIST 485 0101

RUSSIA TO 1900

BROWN, KATHRYN

Title

Instructor:

| Questions | NR | NA | Fr 1 | _ | ncies 3 | 4 | 5 | Ins Mean | tructor Rank | | Dept Mean | | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|----------|-----|---------|--------|------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------------------|---------|--------------|--------|---------------|--------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 13 | 4.61 | 497/1649 | 4.61 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.50 | 4.61 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 10 | 4.44 | 643/1648 | | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.36 | 4.44 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4.64 | | | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.48 | 4.64 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 4.39 | 660/1595 | | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.39 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 4.65 | 256/1533 | | | 4.20 | 4.14 | 4.39 |
| | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 9 | | | | 4.27 | | | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 5 | _ | 4.44 | 479/1512 904/1623 | | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.26 | 4.44 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 8 | 4.18 | | | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 4.18 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 s 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 1 | 4 6 | 13 9 | 4.76 4.50 | 897/1646 374/1621 | | 4.76 4.26 | | 4.71 4.24 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 4.71 | 554/1568 | 4.71 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.54 | 4.71 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 4.71 | 715/1572 | | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.54 | 4.71 |
| | | | 0 | - | | 2 | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 6 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 4.67 | 473/1564 | | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.40 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 4.86 | 261/1559 | | 4.48 | 4.29 | | 4.86 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 4.54 | 286/1352 | 4.54 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 4.07 | 4.54 |
| Discussion | | • | • | | | | | 4 | 056/4004 | | 4 40 | 4 00 | 4 05 | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 4.60 | 376/1384 | | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.35 | 4.60 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.60 | 540/1382 | | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.56 | 4.60 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 4.50 | 654/1368 | | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.58 | 4.50 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3.89 | 542/ 948 | 3.89 | 3.86 | 3.95 | 4.31 | 3.89 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 243 | | **** | 4.12 | 4.61 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | ****/ 555 | **** | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.41 | *** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 88 | | 4.45 | 4.54 | 4.66 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 85 | | 4.06 | 4.47 | 4.54 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 81 | | 4.38 | 4.43 | 4.57 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 92 | **** | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.44 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | ****/ 288 | **** | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.71 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 52 | | **** | 4.06 | 4.86 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 17 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 48 | | **** | 4.09 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 39 | | **** | 4.38 | 4.59 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 11/ 312 | 4.80 | 4.00 | 3.68 | 3.95 | 4.80 |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 53 | | 5.00 | 4.30 | 4.64 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 110 | **** | 4.24 | 3.99 | 4.22 | *** |
| Freq | quency | Dis | trib | utio | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades | 5 | | | Rea | asons | 3 | | | Ту | pe | | | Majors | |
| 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 7 | | Re | auir | ed f | or Ma | ior | | 2 | Graduat | e | 0 | Majo | or | 13 |
| 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 7 | | 100 | -1~++ | - L | 1.10 | ـ ∠ ک ر ـ | ~ | _ | 5244446 | - | 2 | | - | |
| 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 1 C 3 | | Ge: | nera | 1 | | | | 5 | Under-g | rad 1 | 8 | Non- | -major | 5 |
| 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 | | Ge. | шста | - | | | | _ | onder -g | 1 uu 1 | | 14011- | | J |
| Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 | | El | ecti | ves | | | | 1 | #### - | Means t | here a | re not | enoug | h |

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 9 .

Course-Section: HIST 495A 0101

3

PUBLIC HISTORY

MERINGOLO, DENI

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland Page 989 Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

| | | Questions | 3 | | NR | NA | Fre | equer 2 | ncies 3 | 4 | 5 | Inst Mean | ructor Rank | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|----------------|-------------|------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------|------|-------|------------|------------|------|---|--------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| | | General | I | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did vou | ı gain new | insights, skil | | nis course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1649 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.50 | 5.00 |
| - | _ | or make clear | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1648 | 5.00 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.36 | 5.00 |
| | | stions reflect | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1375 | 5.00 | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.48 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did oth | ner evalua | tions reflect | the expec | ted goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1595 | 5.00 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did ass | signed rea | dings contribu | ite to wha | you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 241/1533 | 4.67 | 4.27 | 4.04 | 4.14 | 4.67 |
| 6. Did wri | itten assi | gnments contri | ibute to w | nat you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 263/1512 | 4.67 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.26 | 4.67 |
| | | system clearly | | i | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 5.00 | 1/1623 | 5.00 | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 5.00 |
| | _ | as class cance | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 5.00 | 1/1646 | 5.00 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.71 | 5.00 |
| 9. How wou | ıld you gr | ade the overal | ll teaching | g effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 374/1621 | 4.50 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.24 | 4.50 |
| | | Lecture | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | tor's lectures | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1568 | 5.00 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.54 | 5.00 |
| | | or seem intere | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 5.00 | 1/1572 | 5.00 | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 5.00 |
| | | rial presented | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 5.00 | 1/1564 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.40 | 5.00 |
| | | contribute to | _ | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 5.00 | 1/1559 | 5.00 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.41 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did aud | diovisual | techniques enh | nance your | understanding | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 1219/1352 | 3.00 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 4.07 | 3.00 |
| | | Discuss | sion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | sions contribu | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 5.00 | 1/1384 | 5.00 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.35 | 5.00 |
| | | s actively end | _ | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 5.00 | 1/1382 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.56 | 5.00 |
| | | | | pen discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 5.00 | 1/1368 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.58 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were sp | pecial tec | hniques succes | ssful | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 948 | 5.00 | 3.86 | 3.95 | 4.31 | 5.00 |
| | | Laborat | cory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were re | equirement | s for lab repo | orts clear | ly specified | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/ 555 | 5.00 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.41 | 5.00 |
| | | Semina | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were as | signed to | pics relevant | to the an | nounced theme | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/ 88 | 5.00 | 4.45 | 4.54 | 4.66 | 5.00 |
| 2. Was the | e instruct | or available 1 | for indivi | dual attention | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/ 85 | 5.00 | 4.06 | 4.47 | 4.54 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did res | search pro | jects contribu | ite to wha | you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/ 81 | 5.00 | 4.38 | 4.43 | 4.57 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did pre | esentation | s contribute t | to what you | ı learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 66/ 92 | 4.00 | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.44 | 4.00 |
| 5. Were cr | riteria fo | r grading made | e clear | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 83/ 288 | 4.00 | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.71 | 4.00 |
| | | Field W | Vork | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Did cor | nferences i | help you carry | out field | d activities | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 68/ 312 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 3.68 | 3.95 | 4.00 |
| | | | | Frequ | iency | Dist | tribu | utior | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | j | Expected Grades | | | | Rea | asons | | | | Тут | oe . | | | Majors | ı |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 00-27 28-55 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99 | 0 | A 1 B 2 | | Red | quire | ed fo | or Ma | jors | 5 | 1 | Graduate | 9 | 0 | Majo | r | 2 |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C 0 | | Ger | nera: | 1 | | | | 1 | Under-gr | rad | 3 | Non- | major | 1 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D 0 | | | | | | | | | 9- | | - | |) | = |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F 0 | | Ele | ectiv | ves | | | | 0 | #### - 1 | Means t | here a | re not | enoug | h |
| | | | | P 0 | | | | | | | | | response | | | | _ | |
| | | | | I 0 | | Oth | her | | | | | 1 | _ | | _ | | | |
| | | | | ? 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: HIST 495C 0101 University of Maryland Page 990 Title ARCHIVAL ADMINISTRATIO Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009

Instructor: LEE, STEVEN

Enrollment: 3

Questionnaires: 1

Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

| | | | Fre | equer | ncies | 3 | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|------|------|-----|-------|-------|---|---|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 1603/1649 | 3.00 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.50 | 3.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 1647/1648 | 2.00 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.36 | 2.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | 1591/1595 | 2.00 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 2.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | 1526/1533 | 2.00 | 4.27 | 4.04 | 4.14 | 2.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 1428/1512 | 3.00 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.26 | 3.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 1544/1646 | 4.00 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.71 | 4.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 1504/1621 | 3.00 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.24 | 3.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 1567/1568 | 1.00 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.54 | 1.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1572 | 5.00 | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | 1559/1564 | 2.00 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.40 | 2.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 1557/1559 | 1.00 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.41 | 1.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 1254/1384 | 3.00 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.35 | 3.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1382 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.56 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 948/1368 | 4.00 | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.58 | 4.00 |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Field work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 68/ 312 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 3.68 | 3.95 | 4.00 |
| Frequ | ency | Dist | rib | ution | ı | | | | | | | | | |

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | l Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|----------|----------|---------------------|---|--------------|--------|----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 0 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 1 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 1 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 1 | 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 | 1 |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | nificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | _ | | | |
| | | | | 2 | Ο | | | | | | |

Course-Section: HIST 496 0101

Title HISTORICAL RESEARCH

Instructor: BOUTON, TERRY

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 991 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

| Questions | NR | NA | Fre | equer 2 | cies 3 | 4 | 5 | Inst Mean | ructor Rank | Course Mean | _ | UMBC Mean | | Sect Mean |
|---|-----|----|-----|------------|-----------|---|--------|--------------|----------------------|----------------|------|--------------|-------|--------------|
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 4.56 | 563/1649 | 4.56 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.50 | 4.56 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 4.69 | 336/1648 | 4.69 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.36 | 4.69 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 212/1375 | 4.83 | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.48 | 4.83 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 4.33 | 722/1595 | 4.33 | | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.33 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 4.19 | 688/1533 | 4.19 | 4.27 | 4.04 | 4.14 | 4.19 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 4.60 | 310/1512 | 4.60 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.26 | 4.60 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 4.56 | 437/1623 | 4.56 | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 4.56 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 4.93 | 465/1646 | 4.93 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.71 | 4.93 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | | 4.29 | 654/1621 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.06 | | 4.29 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 4.73 | 517/1568 | 4.73 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.54 | 4.73 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 4.73 | 967/1572 | 4.73 | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 4.73 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 4.67 | 473/1564 | 4.67 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.40 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 4.60 | 586/1559 | 4.60 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.41 | 4.60 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 4.40 | 399/1352 | 4.40 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 4.07 | 4.40 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.27 | 661/1384 | 4.27 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.35 | 4.27 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 243/1382 | 4.91 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.56 | 4.91 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1368 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.58 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 4.75 | 122/ 948 | 4.75 | 3.86 | 3.95 | 4.31 | 4.75 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 243 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 4.61 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 212 | **** | **** | 4.40 | 4.57 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5.00 | 1/ 555 | 5.00 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.41 | 5.00 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 88 | **** | 4.45 | 4.54 | 4.66 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.06 | 4.47 | 4.54 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 81 | **** | 4.38 | 4.43 | 4.57 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 92 | **** | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.44 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 288 | **** | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.71 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 4.86 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.09 | 4.42 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.52 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.38 | 4.59 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 312 | **** | 4.00 | 3.68 | 3.95 | **** |
| Self Paced | 1 - | 6 | | | 6 | 6 | | | | 44 | F 00 | 4 22 | 4 - 4 | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 53 | **** | 5.00 | 4.30 | 4.64 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 30 | **** | 4.00 | 4.16 | 4.24 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 41 ****/ 24 | **** | 5.00 | 4.43 | 4.84 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 1 | 5.00 | , 21 | **** | 4.00 | 4.42 | 4.85 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 15 | U | U | U | U | U | Т | 5.00 | ****/ 110 | | 4.24 | 3.99 | 4.22 | |

Course-Section: HIST 496 0101

Title HISTORICAL RESEARCH

Instructor: BOUTON, TERRY

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 991 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|----------|--------|---------------------|----|--------------|-------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 4 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 14 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | С | 3 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 16 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 8 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | h |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be si | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 14 | _ | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: HIST 497 0101

Title HISTORICAL RESEARCH

Instructor: BROWN, KATHRYN

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 992 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

| Student | Course | ${\tt Evaluation}$ | Questionnaire |
|---------|--------|--------------------|---------------|
|---------|--------|--------------------|---------------|

| | | | Fre | equer | ncie | s | | Inst | tructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------|-----|------|-------|-------|------|--------|------|-----------|--------------|--------------|------|--------|----------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| 01 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 4.36 | 830/1649 | 4.36 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.50 | 4.36 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4 | | 1070/1648 | 4.09 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.36 | 4.09 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | ****/1375 | **** | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.48 | **** |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4.45 | 566/1595 | 4.45 | 4.28 | 4.20 | | 4.45 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | | 1358/1533 | 3.27 | 4.27 | 4.04 | 4.14 | 3.27 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 4.27 | 663/1512 | | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.26 | 4.27 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 4.36 | 683/1623 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 4.36 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | _ | | 1157/1646 | 4.55 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.71 | 4.55 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4.43 | 483/1621 | | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.24 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 20 | 1096/1568 | 4 20 | 4 54 | 1 12 | 4.54 | 4.29 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 6 | 4.29 | 931/1572 | 4.29 4.75 | 4.54 4.84 | 4.43 | 4.79 | 4.29 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | | | 1127/1564 | | 4.46 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 4.75 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | | | 1221/1559 | 3.86 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.41 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | | | 1189/1352 | | | 3.98 | | 3.17 |
| 3. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 4 | 1 | U | 3 | 1 | _ | 3.17 | 1109/1332 | 3.17 | 4.07 | 3.90 | 4.07 | 3.17 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4.44 | 499/1384 | 4.44 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.35 | 4.44 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1382 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.56 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 285/1368 | 4.89 | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.58 | 4.89 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4.14 | 389/ 948 | 4.14 | 3.86 | 3.95 | 4.31 | 4.14 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/ 555 | 5.00 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.41 | 5.00 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 45/ 88 | 4.67 | 4.45 | 4.54 | 4.66 | 4.67 |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 4.67 | 38/ 85 | 4.67 | 4.06 | 4.47 | | 4.67 |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | 51/ 81 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.43 | 4.57 | 4.33 |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 66/ 92 | 4.00 | 3.93 | 4.35 | | 4.00 |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4.00 | 83/ 288 | 4.00 | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.71 | 4.00 |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 17/ 110 | 4.50 | 4.24 | 3.99 | 4.22 | 4.50 |
| Frequ | iency | Dis | trib | ution | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades | | | | Rea | ason | s | | | Ту | pe | | | Majors | ; |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 | | Red | quir | ed fo | or Ma | ajor | 3 | 0 | Graduat | е | 0 | Majo | r | 7 |

| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | l Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|------------|-------|-----------|---|----------|----------|---------------------|---|--------------|--------|----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 3 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 7 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 5 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 1 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 11 | Non-major | 4 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | mificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 9 | _ | | | |
| | | | | 2 | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: HIST 643 0101

THE U.S. SINCE 1945

Title Instructor: SMEAD, HOWARD

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 993 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

| | | | | | | | Fre | equer | ncies | \$ | | Inst | tructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|------------|---|----------------------------------|----------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|------|-----------|---------|--------|---------|--------|------|
| | | Question | .s | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | Genera | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did voi | ı gain ne | w insights,ski | | this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1649 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.46 | 5.00 |
| | | tor make clear | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4.56 | , | | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.34 | 4.56 |
| | | estions reflec | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4.56 | 505/1375 | | | 4.27 | 4.44 | 4.56 |
| | | ations reflect | | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 4.50 | | 4.50 | | 4.20 | 4.35 | 4.50 |
| | | | | what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | | | 327/1533 | | 4.27 | 4.04 | 4.28 | 4.56 |
| | | | | what you learned | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | _ | | 263/1512 | | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.35 | 4.67 |
| | | signments contr system clearl | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | - | | 448/1623 | | | 4.16 | 4.29 | 4.56 |
| | | was class canc | | .neu | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - | | 1037/1646 | | | 4.69 | | 4.67 |
| | - | | | ning effectiveness | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - | | 270/1621 | | | | 4.20 | |
| 9. HOW WOL | ara you g | rade the overa | II teach | ing effectiveness | 1 | U | U | U | U | 3 | 5 | 4.03 | 270/1621 | 4.03 | 4.20 | 4.00 | 4.20 | 4.03 |
| | | Lectur | е | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were th | ne instru | ctor's lecture | s well p | repared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 4.78 | 442/1568 | 4.78 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.52 | 4.78 |
| 2. Did the | e instruc | tor seem inter | ested ir | ı the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1572 | 5.00 | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.83 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was led | cture mat | erial presente | d and ex | xplained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4.56 | 600/1564 | 4.56 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.41 | 4.56 |
| 4. Did the | e lecture | s contribute t | o what y | ou learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.78 | 361/1559 | 4.78 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.41 | 4.78 |
| | | | _ | our understanding | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 3.75 | 914/1352 | 3.75 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 4.10 | 3.75 |
| | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Discus | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | | | 937/1384 | | | 4.08 | 4.30 | 3.80 |
| | | _ | _ | d to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | | | 1316/1382 | 3.00 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.52 | 3.00 |
| | | _ | | d open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | | | 1071/1368 | 3.80 | | 4.30 | 4.56 | 3.80 |
| 4. Were sp | pecial te | chniques succe | ssful | | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 948 | *** | 3.86 | 3.95 | 4.03 | **** |
| | | Labora | torv | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were re | equiremen | | - | early specified | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 555 | **** | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.66 | **** |
| | | Semina | r | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were cr | riteria f | or grading mad | e clear | | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 288 | **** | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.87 | **** |
| | | Field | Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Did cor | nferences | help you carr | y out fi | ield activities | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 312 | **** | 4.00 | 3.68 | 3.83 | **** |
| | | Self | Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were th | Were there enough proctors for all the students | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4.00 | 40/ 110 | 4.00 | 4.24 | 3.99 | 3.92 | 4.00 |
| | | | | Freq | uency | Dist | trib | ution | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | | | Rea | asons | \$ | | | Ту | pe | | | Majors | 3 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A 4 | | Rec | quire | ed fo | or Ma | ijors | 5 | 1 | Graduat | е | 1 | Majo | or | 7 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C 0 | | Ger | nera: | 1 | | | | 2 | Under-g | rad | 8 | Non- | -major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F 0 | | $El\epsilon$ | ectiv | ves | | | | 0 | #### - 1 | | | | | gh |
| Grad. | Τ. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | | | P 0 | | | | | | | | | respons | es to b | e sign | nificar | nt | |
| | Τ. | | | P 0 I 0 | | Otł | her | | | | | 5 | respons | es to b | e sign | nificar | ıt | |

Course-Section: HIST 645 0101 University of Maryland Title HIST OF SCIENCE TO 170 Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: TATAREWICZ, JOS

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 994

| | | | Fre | eque: | ncies | S | | Inst | tructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|------|------|------|--------|-------|---|---|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | • | 0 | 0 | _ | 0 | 0 | _ | 2 00 | 1602/1640 | 2 00 | 1 16 | 4 00 | 4 46 | 2 00 |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | | 1603/1649 | | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.46 | 3.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | | 1591/1648 | | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.34 | 3.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | | 1328/1375 | 3.00 | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.44 | 3.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | Τ | 0 | 0 | Τ | | 1397/1595 | | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.35 | 3.50 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | 815/1533 | | 4.27 | 4.04 | 4.28 | 4.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | 883/1512 | | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.35 | 4.00 |
| Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | 1599/1623 | | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.29 | 2.50 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1646 | 5.00 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.81 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | 914/1621 | 4.00 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.20 | 4.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | Λ | 1 | Λ | Λ | 2 00 | 1515/1568 | 3.00 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.52 | 3.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | 1556/1572 | | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.83 | 3.00 |
| | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | | 1496/1564 | | 4.46 | 4.70 | 4.63 | 3.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | - | - | 1 | | - | 0 | | , | | | | | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 1550/1559 | | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.41 | 2.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 0 | 0 | Τ | U | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | 1335/1352 | 2.00 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 4.10 | 2.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 1254/1384 | 3.00 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.30 | 3.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | 1316/1382 | | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.52 | 3.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | 1286/1368 | | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.56 | 3.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 844/ 948 | | 3.86 | 3.95 | 4.03 | 3.00 |
| 1. Mere apectar eccumiques auccessius | | U | J | U | _ | J | U | 5.00 | 011/ 540 | 5.00 | 3.00 | 3.75 | 1.03 | 3.00 |
| From | onar | Diat | -rih | u+ i o | n | | | | | | | | | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 650 0101 University of Maryland Page 995 Title SOC HIST OF AMER MEDCN Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: ROTHSTEIN, WILL Fall 2008

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 1

| | | | Fre | eque | ncies | 3 | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|------|------|-------|------|-------|---|---|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1649 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.46 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1648 | 5.00 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.34 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1375 | 5.00 | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.44 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 1537/1595 | 3.00 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.35 | 3.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 815/1533 | 4.00 | 4.27 | 4.04 | 4.28 | 4.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1623 | 5.00 | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.29 | 5.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1646 | 5.00 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.81 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 914/1621 | 4.00 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.20 | 4.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1568 | 5.00 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.52 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1572 | 5.00 | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.83 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 1127/1564 | 4.00 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.41 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1559 | 5.00 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.41 | 5.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 795/1384 | 4.00 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.30 | 4.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 946/1382 | 4.00 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.52 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 948/1368 | | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.56 | 4.00 |
| Frequ | ency | Dist | tribu | utio | n | | | | | | | | | |

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 996

Course-Section: HIST 662 0101 Title MEDIEVAL EUROPE FEB 11, 2009 MCDONOUGH, SUSA Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 1 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

0

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

| | | | | | | | Fre | eque: | ncie | s | | Ins | tructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|-------------------------|--|-------------------|---------|---|-------|------|----------|-----------|--------|------|-----------|---------|-----------|--------|------|-------|--------|------|
| | | Question | s | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | Genera | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did yo | u gain ne | ew insights,ski | lls fro | om this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 1183/1649 | 4.00 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.46 | 4.00 |
| | | ctor make clear | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 1124/1648 | 4.00 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.34 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did ot | her evalı | uations reflect | the ex | spected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1595 | 5.00 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.35 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did as | signed re | eadings contrib | ute to | what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 815/1533 | 4.00 | 4.27 | 4.04 | 4.28 | 4.00 |
| 6. Did wr | itten ass | signments contr | ibute t | to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 883/1512 | 4.00 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.35 | 4.00 |
| 7. Was th | e grading | g system clearl | y expla | ained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1623 | 5.00 | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.29 | 5.00 |
| 8. How man | ny times | was class canc | elled | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1646 | 5.00 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.81 | 5.00 |
| 9. How wo | uld you g | grade the overa | ll tead | ching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 1504/1621 | 3.00 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.20 | 3.00 |
| | | Lectur | e | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were t | he instru | uctor's lecture | s well | prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 1279/1568 | 4.00 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.52 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did th | e instruc | ctor seem inter | ested i | n the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1572 | 5.00 | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.83 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was le | cture mat | terial presente | d and e | explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 1127/1564 | 4.00 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.41 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did th | e lecture | es contribute t | o what | you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 1121/1559 | 4.00 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.41 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did au | diovisual | our understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 1219/1352 | 3.00 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 4.10 | 3.00 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did cl | ass discu | ussions contrib | ute to | what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 795/1384 | 4.00 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.30 | 4.00 |
| | | | | ed to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1382 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.52 | 5.00 |
| | | | | nd open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1368 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.56 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were s | pecial te | echniques succe | ssful | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 945/ 948 | 1.00 | 3.86 | 3.95 | 4.03 | 1.00 |
| | | Labora | tory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were r | equiremen | nts for lab rep | orts cl | early specified | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/ 555 | 5.00 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.66 | 5.00 |
| | Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were c | . Were criteria for grading made clear | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 83/ 288 | 4.00 | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.87 | 4.00 |
| | | | | Frequ | iency | Dis | trib | utio: | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | | | Re | ason | s | | | Ty | pe | | | Majors | ; |
| 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 0 | | | | | Re | auir | ed f | or M: | aior | | 0 | Graduat | e | 0 | Majo | r | 1 | |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | 1 | | | | | Gradac | _ | ~ | 1100 | - | _ | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C 0 | | Gei | nera: | 1 | | | | 0 | Under-g | rad | 1 | Non- | major | 0 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D 0 | | | | | | | | - | | | | | 5 2 | - |
| | | | | - - | | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | |

Electives

Other

0

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: HIST 666 0101 Univ Title THE REFORMATION B Instructor: GRUBB, JAMES S

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

2

University of Maryland Page 997
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

| Student | Course | Evaluation | Question | naire |
|---------|--------|------------|----------|-------|
| | | | | |

| | | | | | | | _ | ncies | | _ | | ructor | Course | _ | | Level | Sect | |
|------------|-------------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|----------|---------|--------|--------|--------|------|
| | | Question | 5 | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | Genera | l | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you | u gain ne | w insights,ski | lls from | m this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1649 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.46 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the | e instruc | tor make clear | the exp | pected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1648 | 5.00 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.34 | 5.00 |
| | | estions reflect | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1375 | 5.00 | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.44 | 5.00 |
| | | ations reflect | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1595 | 5.00 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.35 | 5.00 |
| | | | | what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 5.00 | 4.27 | 4.04 | 4.28 | 5.00 |
| | | | | o what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1512 | 5.00 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.35 | 5.00 |
| | | system clearly | | ined | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 5.00 | 1/1623 | 5.00 | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.29 | 5.00 |
| | - | was class cance | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 5.00 | 1/1646 | 5.00 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.81 | 5.00 |
| 9. How wor | uld you g | rade the overa | ll teach | ning effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1621 | 5.00 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.20 | 5.00 |
| | | Lecture | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were th | he instru | ctor's lectures | s well p | prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1568 | 5.00 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.52 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the | e instruc | tor seem intere | ested in | n the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1572 | 5.00 | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.83 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was led | cture mat | erial presented | d and ex | xplained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1564 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.41 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the | e lecture | s contribute to | what y | you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1559 | 5.00 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.41 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did au | diovisual | techniques enl | nance yo | our understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | 690/1352 | 4.00 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 4.10 | 4.00 |
| | | Discus | sion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did cla | ass discu | | | what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1384 | 5.00 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.30 | 5.00 |
| | | | | d to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 5.00 | 1/1382 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.52 | 5.00 |
| | | | | d open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1368 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.56 | 5.00 |
| | | chniques succes | | - of | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 948 | 5.00 | | 3.95 | | 5.00 |
| | | Labora | orv | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were re | equiremen | | - | early specified | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/ 555 | 5.00 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.66 | 5.00 |
| | | - 16 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were tl | here enou | Self I gh proctors fo | | ne students | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 40/ 110 | 4.00 | 4.24 | 3.99 | 3.92 | 4.00 |
| 3 | 11010 01100 | .911 P1000012 10. | | | | | | | | _ | Ü | 1.00 | 10, 110 | 1.00 | | 3.,, | 3.72 | 1.00 |
| | | | | Frequ | ency | Dist | tribu | ution | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | | | Rea | asons | 5 | | | Туј | pe | | | Majors | 3 |
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A 2 | | Red | quire | ed fo | or Ma | ajors | 3 | 1 | Graduat | e | 1 | Majo | or | 2 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | в 0 | | | - | | | _ | | | | | | 3 - | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C 0 | | Gei | nera: | l | | | | 1 | Under-g | rad | 1 | Non- | -major | 0 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D 0 | | | | | | | | | 3 | | | | - | |
| Grad. | 1 | 3.50-4.00 | 0 | F 0 | | Ele | ecti | ves | | | | 0 | #### - 1 | Means t | here a | re not | enoug | jh |
| | | | | P 0 | | | | | | | | | response | es to b | e sign | ifican | ıt | |
| | | | | I 0 | | Otl | ner | | | | | 0 | _ | | _ | | | |
| | | | | ? 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: HIST 671 0101 University of Maryland INDUSTRIAL BRITAIN Baltimore County

Title Instructor: FROIDE, AMY

Enrollment: 5 Ouestionnaires: 3

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 998 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Ouestions 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 241/1533 4.67 4.27 4.04 4.28 4.67 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1512 5.00 4.29 4.10 4.35 5.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1/1623 5.00 4.38 4.16 4.29 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1646 5.00 4.76 4.69 4.81 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 234/1621 4.67 4.26 4.06 4.20 4.67 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1568 5.00 4.54 4.43 4.52 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1572 5.00 4.84 4.70 4.83 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1564 5.00 4.46 4.28 4.41 5.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.48 4.29 4.41 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1352 5.00 4.07 3.98 4.10 5.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 326/1384 4.67 4.12 4.08 4.30 4.67 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.36 4.29 4.52 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1368 5.00 4.46 4.30 4.56 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/948 5.00 3.86 3.95 4.03 5.00 Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 2 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 490/555 3.00 4.89 4.29 4.66 3.00 Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 2 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 83/288 4.00 3.81 3.68 3.87 4.00 Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 2 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 40/110 4.00 4.24 3.99 3.92 4.00 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Majors ______ 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Graduate 0 Major 3 00-27 1 Required for Majors 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 General 0 Under-grad 3 Non-major 0 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant

Other

3

I 0

Course-Section: HIST 677 0101 University of Maryland Title

HISTORY OF CHINA TO 16 Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: YIP, KA-CHE

Enrollment: 1 Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 999 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

| | | | | | | | Fr | equei | ncies | | | Ins | tructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--------------|-----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|-------|------|-------------------|-------|-------|------|-------|------|-----------|---------|--------|-----------|--------|------|
| | | Question | s | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | Genera | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did vo | u gain ne | ew insights,ski | | om this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1649 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.46 | 5.00 |
| | | ctor make clear | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1648 | | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.34 | 5.00 |
| | | estions reflec | | 1 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1375 | | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.44 | 5.00 |
| | | ations reflect | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 1067/1595 | | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.35 | 4.00 |
| | | | | what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 815/1533 | | 4.27 | 4.04 | 4.28 | 4.00 |
| | | | | to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1512 | | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.35 | 5.00 |
| | | g system clearl | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 1029/1623 | 4.00 | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.29 | 4.00 |
| | | was class canc | | arried | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1646 | | 4.76 | 4.69 | | 5.00 |
| o. now ilia. | ny times | was class call | eilea | | U | U | U | U | U | U | | 5.00 | 1/1040 | 5.00 | 4.70 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 3.00 |
| | | Lectur | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | actor's lecture | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 1279/1568 | 4.00 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.52 | 4.00 |
| | | ctor seem inter | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1572 | 5.00 | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.83 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was le | cture mat | erial presente | d and e | explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1564 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.41 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did th | e lecture | es contribute t | o what | you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1559 | 5.00 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.41 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did au | diovisual | l techniques en | hance y | our understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1352 | 5.00 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 4.10 | 5.00 |
| | | Discus | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did cla | ass discr | | | what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 1254/1384 | 3.00 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.30 | 3.00 |
| | | | | ed to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1382 | | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.52 | 5.00 |
| | | | | nd open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | | | 4.46 | 4.30 | | 4.00 |
| 3. 21a cm | | Joor Giloouruge | | a open alboablen | Ü | Ü | Ü | Ü | Ü | _ | Ü | 1.00 | 310, 1300 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.00 |
| | | Labora | - | | | | • | • | | | _ | | 4 / 555 | | 4 00 | | | |
| 5. Were r | equiremer | nts for lab rep | orts c. | early specified | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/ 555 | 5.00 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.66 | 5.00 |
| | | Self | Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did se | lf-paced | system contrib | ute to | what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/ 53 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.30 | 4.37 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did st | udy quest | ions make clea | r the e | expected goal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 18/ 30 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.16 | 4.49 | 4.00 |
| | | acts with the i | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/ 41 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.43 | 4.43 | 5.00 |
| | | ck/tutoring by | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 17/ 24 | | 4.00 | 4.42 | 4.67 | 4.00 |
| | | igh proctors fo | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 1/ 110 | | 4.24 | 3.99 | | 5.00 |
| | | | | Frequ | enas | Diet | -rih | utio | n | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | riequ | lency | DIS | LLID | ucioi | 11 | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | | | Rea | asons | | | | Ty | pe | | | Majors | } |
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 0 | | Red | guir | ed f | or Ma | jors | 3 | 0 | Graduat | e | 1 | Majo | or | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В 1 | | | | | | , | - | - | | - | |) • | | - |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C 0 | | Ger | nera | 1 | | | | 0 | Under-g | rad | 0 | Non- | -major | 1 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D 0 | | 001 | a | _ | | | | - | onacr 9 | | • | 1,011 | | _ |
| Grad. | 1 | 3.50-4.00 | 0 | F 0 | | E14 | ecti [.] | ves | | | | 0 | #### - 1 | Means + | here a | re not | enous | rh |
| JI aa. | _ | 3.30 1.00 | J | P 0 | | 1110 | | v CD | | | | | respons | | | | | 111 |
| | | | | I O | | Otł | hor | | | | | 1 | respons | CD LO L | c sign | ııı ıcaı. | 10 | |
| | | | | 5 0 T 0 | | ULI | 1CT | | | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| | | | | ? U | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: HIST 685 0101 University of Maryland RUSSIA TO 1900 Baltimore County

Page 1000 Title FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: BROWN, KATHRYN (Instr. A)

| Enrollment: | 2 | |
|-----------------|---|---|
| Questionnaires: | 2 | Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire |

| | | | | | | | | Eν | 201121 | ncies | , | | Tnat | ructor | Course | Dont | TIMDC | Level | Sect |
|----|--------------|----------|-----------------------------|------------------|-----------|------|------|-------|--------|-------|--------|---------|--------|------------|--------|------|--------|-------|------|
| | | | Questions | | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | _ | | Mean | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | D | | General | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | _ | _ | 0 | F 00 | 1 /1 6 4 0 | F 00 | 1 16 | 4 00 | 1 16 | F 00 |
| | | | | ls from this co | | 0 | 0 | U | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1649 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.46 | 5.00 |
| | | | | the expected go | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1648 | 5.00 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.34 | 5.00 |
| | | | | the expected g | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1375 | 5.00 | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.44 | 5.00 |
| | | | | the expected go | | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1595 | 5.00 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.35 | 5.00 |
| | | _ | - | ite to what you | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | 1/1533 | 5.00 | 4.27 | 4.04 | 4.28 | 5.00 |
| | | | _ | bute to what yo | u learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1512 | 5.00 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.35 | 5.00 |
| | | | g system clearly | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1623 | 5.00 | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.29 | 5.00 |
| | | • | was class cance | | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | 1/1646 | 5.00 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.81 | 5.00 |
| 9. | How wou | ld you g | grade the overal | l teaching effe | ctiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1621 | 5.00 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.20 | 5.00 |
| | | | Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | Were the | e instru | actor's lectures | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1568 | 5.00 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.52 | 5.00 | |
| | Did the | | iect. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | 1/1572 | | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.83 | 5.00 | | |
| | Was lect | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | 1/1564 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.41 | 5.00 | | | |
| | Did the | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | 1/1559 | 5.00 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.41 | 5.00 | | | |
| | Did aud | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 1/1352 | | | 3.98 | 4.10 | 5.00 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| _ | | | Discuss | | | _ | _ | | | _ | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | ite to what you | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | 1/1384 | 5.00 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.30 | 5.00 |
| | | | | ouraged to part | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | 1/1382 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.52 | 5.00 |
| | | | | air and open di | scussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | 1/1368 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.56 | 5.00 |
| 4. | Were spe | ecial te | echniques succes | sful | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 948 | 5.00 | 3.86 | 3.95 | 4.03 | 5.00 |
| | | | Laborat | ory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. | Were re | quiremer | nts for lab repo | orts clearly spe | cified | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/ 555 | 5.00 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.66 | 5.00 |
| | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. | Were cr | iteria f | Seminar For grading made | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 83/ 288 | 4.00 | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.87 | 4.00 |
| ٠. | WOLG 01. | 100114 | | _ | | Ü | ŭ | Ü | _ | Ū | 1.00 | 03, 200 | 1.00 | 3.01 | 3.00 | 3.07 | 1.00 | | |
| | | | Freq | uency | Dis | trib | utio | n | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cr | edits Ea | rned | Cum. GPA | ed Grades | | | | Rea | asons | 5 | | | Ту | pe | | | Majors | | |
| | 0.07 | | 0.00-0.99 | 0 A | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 0-27 8-55 | 0 0 | 0 2 | | ке | quir | ea i | or Ma | ajors | 5 | 0 | Graduat | е | 0 | Majo | r | 1 | | |

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

Course-Section: HIST 685 0101 University of Maryland Page 1001 Title RUSSIA TO 1900 Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: (Instr. B)

2 Enrollment: Questionnaires: 2

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | Question | s | | NR | NA | Fre | _ | ncies 3 | 4 | 5 | Inst Mean | ructor Rank | | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | | Sect Mean |
|-----------|------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------|--------|-------|------|------------|----------------|---------|--------------|----------------|---------|--------------|--------------|--------|--------------|
| | | Genera | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did vo | ou gain ne | ew insights,ski | _ | m this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1649 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.46 | 5.00 |
| | | ctor make clear | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1648 | 5.00 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.34 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did th | ne exam qu | uestions reflec | t the e | xpected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1375 | 5.00 | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.44 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did ot | ther evalu | uations reflect | the ex | pected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1595 | 5.00 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.35 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did as | ssigned re | eadings contrib | ute to | what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 5.00 | 4.27 | 4.04 | 4.28 | 5.00 |
| 6. Did wr | ritten ass | signments contr | ibute t | o what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1512 | 5.00 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.35 | 5.00 |
| 7. Was th | ne grading | g system clearl | y expla | ined | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1623 | 5.00 | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.29 | 5.00 |
| 8. How ma | any times | was class canc | elled | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1646 | 5.00 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.81 | 5.00 |
| | | Lectur | е | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were t | the instru | uctor's lecture | s well | prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1568 | 5.00 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.52 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did th | ne instru | ctor seem inter | ested i | n the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1572 | 5.00 | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.83 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was le | ecture mat | terial presente | d and e | xplained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1564 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.41 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did th | ne lecture | you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1559 | 5.00 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.41 | 5.00 | | |
| | | Discus | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did cl | lass disc | ussions contrib | what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1384 | 5.00 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.30 | 5.00 | |
| | | d to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1382 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.52 | 5.00 | | |
| | | | | d open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1368 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.56 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were s | special te | echniques succe | ssful | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 948 | 5.00 | 3.86 | 3.95 | 4.03 | 5.00 |
| | | Labora | torv | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were r | requiremen | | | early specified | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/ 555 | 5.00 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.66 | 5.00 |
| | | Semina | r | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were o | criteria 1 | for grading mad | e clear | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 83/ 288 | 4.00 | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.87 | 4.00 |
| | | | | Frequ | iency | / Dist | trib | utio | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits E | Carned | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | | | Rea | asons | : | | | Ту | ne | | | Majors | ł. |
| | | | | | | | | | | , . – – – - | | | | | | | | |
| 00-27 | 0 | A 0 | | Red | quir | ed f | or Ma | jors | 3 | 0 | Graduat | е | 0 | Majo | r | 1 | | |
| 28-55 | 0 | B 2 | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | C 0 | | Gei | nera | T | | | | 1 | Under-g | rad | 2 | Non- | major | 1 | | |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D 0 | | TO 2 | | | | | | 0 | шшшш , | VI + | .b | | | .lo |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 0 | F 0 P 0 | | ΕI | ecti | ves | | | | 0 | #### - 1 | | | | _ | 111 |
| | | | | I O | | O+1 | her | | | | | 1 | respons | LD LU L | , a191. | ıııcan | | |
| | | | 1 0 | | OLI | TCT | | | | | _ | | | | | | | |

?

Course-Section: HIST 685 0101 University of Maryland Page 1002
Title RUSSIA TO 1900 Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009

Instructor: (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 2
Questionnaires: 2

Fall 2008
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

| | | | | | | | Fre | eque | ncies | | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|----------------|--|------------------------|------------|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|----------|------|
| | | Questions | 5 | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | Genera | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you | u gain ne | w insights,ski | _ | om this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1649 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.46 | 5.00 |
| | | tor make clear | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1648 | 5.00 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.34 | 5.00 |
| | | estions reflect | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1375 | 5.00 | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.44 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did oth | her evalu | ations reflect | the ex | spected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1595 | 5.00 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.35 | 5.00 |
| | | | | what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 5.00 | 4.27 | 4.04 | 4.28 | 5.00 |
| 6. Did wri | itten ass | signments contri | ibute t | to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1512 | 5.00 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.35 | 5.00 |
| 7. Was the | e grading | system clearly | y expla | ined | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1623 | 5.00 | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.29 | 5.00 |
| 8. How mar | ny times | was class cance | elled | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1646 | 5.00 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.81 | 5.00 |
| | | Lecture | <u> </u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were th | he instru | ctor's lecture | | prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1568 | 5.00 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.52 | 5.00 |
| | | tor seem inter | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 1/1572 | | 4.84 | 4.70 | | 5.00 |
| | | | | explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 1/1564 | | 4.46 | 4.28 | | 5.00 |
| | | es contribute to | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1559 | | 4.48 | 4.29 | | 5.00 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Did al- | ana dina | what wou learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1384 | 5.00 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.30 | 5.00 | | |
| | Did class discussions contribute to what you learn Were all students actively encouraged to participa | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1384 | | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.52 | 5.00 |
| | | | | nd open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1362 | | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.56 | 5.00 |
| | | chniques succes | | d open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1300 | | | 3.95 | | 5.00 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 Were re | agui remen | Laborat | - | early specified | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1 / 555 | 5.00 | 4 80 | 4 29 | 4 66 | 5.00 |
| J. Wele it | equitemen | ics for tab repo | JI CS CI | learly specified | 1 | U | U | U | U | U | _ | 3.00 | 1/ 333 | 3.00 | 4.00 | 4.20 | 4.00 | 3.00 |
| | | Semina | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were ci | riteria f | for grading made | e clear | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 83/ 288 | 4.00 | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.87 | 4.00 |
| | | | | Frequ | iency | Dist | tribu | utio | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | | | Rea | asons | | | | Ту | pe | | | Majors | ; |
| | | · | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | |
| 00-27 28-55 | 0 0 | A 0 B 2 | | Red | quire | ed f | or Ma | jors | 3 | 0 | Graduat | е | 0 | Majo | r | 1 | | |
| 28-55 56-83 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99 | B 2 C 0 | | Cos | nera: | 1 | | | | 1 | Under-g | rad | 2 | Non | major | 1 | |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-2.99 | 0 0 | D 0 | | Gei | iera. | L | | | | 1 | onder-9 | Lau | 4 | MOII- | ıııa Jor | Т |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 0 | F 0 | | בות | ectiv | 760 | | | | 0 | #### - | Meane + | here a | re not | enous | rh |
| Grau. | U | 3.30-4.00 | U | P O | | 11.1 | | v CD | | | | U | respons | | | | _ | 111 |
| | | | | F 0 | | | | | | | | _ | rephone | CD LO L | c bigin | ıııcan | | |

Other

1

Ι

0

Course-Section: HIST 685 0101 University of Maryland Page 1003
Title RUSSIA TO 1900 Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009

Instructor: (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 2
Questionnaires: 2

Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

| General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1649 5.00 4.46 4.28 4.46 5.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 8. How many times was class cancelled 8. How many times well prepared 9. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 3. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 4. Did the lecture material presented and explained clearly 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did the instructor explained sexplained clearly 3. Did the instructor explained sexplained sexpl | | | 0 | | | M | 377 | | _ | ncies | 5 | - | | ructor | | Dept | | Level | Sect |
|--|------------|---|-----------------|---------|-------------------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|--------------------|-------|------|----------|---------|---------|---------|----------|----------|
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1649 5.00 4.46 4.28 4.46 5.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1648 5.00 4.38 4.23 4.34 5.00 4.30 the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1375 5.00 4.66 4.27 4.44 5.00 4.30 the part of the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1375 5.00 4.28 4.20 4.35 5.00 5.00 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1555 5.00 4.28 4.20 4.35 5.00 5.01 dissigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1551 5.00 4.27 4.04 4.28 5.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1533 5.00 4.27 4.04 4.28 5.00 7.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1623 5.00 4.38 4.16 4.29 5.00 7.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | | Question | s | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | - 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1/1648 5.00 4.38 4.23 4.34 5.00 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1375 5.00 4.66 4.27 4.44 5.00 4.01 to the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1595 5.00 4.28 4.20 4.35 5.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1595 5.00 4.28 4.20 4.35 5.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1/1533 5.00 4.27 4.04 4.28 5.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1/1513 5.00 4.29 4.10 4.35 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | | Genera | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1375 5.00 4.66 4.27 4.44 5.00 4.01 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1595 5.00 4.28 4.20 4.35 5.00 6. Did sasigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1593 5.00 4.28 4.20 4.35 5.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1512 5.00 4.29 4.10 4.35 5.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1612 5.00 4.29 4.10 4.35 5.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1623 5.00 4.29 4.10 4.35 5.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1623 5.00 4.29 4.10 4.35 5.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1/1623 5.00 4.76 4.69 4.81 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1668 5.00 4.76 4.69 4.81 5.00 9. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1568 5.00 4.54 4.43 4.52 5.00 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1572 5.00 4.84 4.70 4.83 5.00 9. Did the instructor experience of the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1579 5.00 4.46 4.28 4.41 5.00 9. Discussion 9. Discussi | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | , | | 4.46 | | 4.46 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1595 5.00 4.28 4.20 4.35 5.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1533 5.00 4.27 4.04 4.28 5.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1513 5.00 4.27 4.04 4.28 5.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1612 5.00 4.29 4.10 4.35 5.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1623 5.00 4.38 4.16 4.29 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1646 5.00 4.76 4.69 4.81 5.00 9.00 9.00 9.00 9.00 9.00 9.00 9.00 | | | | | | 0 | - | - | 0 | | 0 | _ | | , | 5.00 | 4.38 | | 4.34 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1533 5.00 4.27 4.04 4.28 5.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1512 5.00 4.29 4.10 4.35 5.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1623 5.00 4.38 4.16 4.29 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1646 5.00 4.76 4.69 4.81 5.00 9.00 9.00 9.00 9.00 9.00 9.00 9.00 | | | | | | - | - | | - | - | - | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1512 5.00 4.29 4.10 4.35 5.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1623 5.00 4.38 4.16 4.29 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1646 5.00 4.76 4.69 4.81 5.00 | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1623 5.00 4.38 4.16 4.29 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1646 5.00 4.76 4.69 4.81 5.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1568 5.00 4.54 4.43 4.52 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1572 5.00 4.84 4.70 4.83 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1564 5.00 4.46 4.28 4.41 5.00 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4 | | | | | | | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | | | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1646 5.00 4.76 4.69 4.81 5.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1568 5.00 4.54 4.43 4.52 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1572 5.00 4.84 4.70 4.83 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1564 5.00 4.46 4.28 4.41 5.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.48 4.29 4.41 5.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1384 5.00 4.12 4.08 4.30 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.36 4.29 4.52 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1368 5.00 4.46 4.30 4.56 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 948 5.00 3.86 3.95 4.03 5.00 Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 555 5.00 4.89 4.29 4.66 5.00 | | | | | | | • | • | • | • | - | | | | | | | | |
| Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to material prepared 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions discussions discussion 1. Did class discussions discussions discussion 1. Did class discussions discussions discussion discussion 1. Did class discussions discussions discussion discussion 1. Did class discussions discussions discussion disc | | | | | ined | | - | | | | - | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6. Were special techniques successful Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 7. O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O | 8. How man | ny times | was class canc | elled | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1646 | 5.00 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.81 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1572 5.00 4.84 4.70 4.83 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1564 5.00 4.46 4.28 4.41 5.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.48 4.29 4.41 5.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1384 5.00 4.12 4.08 4.30 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.36 4.29 4.52 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1368 5.00 4.46 4.30 4.56 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 948 5.00 3.86 3.95 4.03 5.00 Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 555 5.00 4.89 4.29 4.66 5.00 Seminar | | | Lectur | e | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1564 5.00 4.46 4.28 4.41 5.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.48 4.29 4.41 5.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1384 5.00 4.12 4.08 4.30 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.36 4.29 4.52 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1368 5.00 4.46 4.30 4.56 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 948 5.00 3.86 3.95 4.03 5.00 Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 555 5.00 4.89 4.29 4.66 5.00 Seminar | 1. Were th | he instru | actor's lecture | s well | prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1568 | 5.00 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.52 | 5.00 |
| A. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.48 4.29 4.41 5.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1384 5.00 4.12 4.08 4.30 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.36 4.29 4.52 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1368 5.00 4.46 4.30 4.56 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 948 5.00 3.86 3.95 4.03 5.00 Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 555 5.00 4.89 4.29 4.66 5.00 Seminar | 2. Did the | e instruc | ctor seem inter | ested i | n the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1572 | 5.00 | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.83 | 5.00 |
| Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1384 5.00 4.12 4.08 4.30 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.36 4.29 4.52 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1368 5.00 4.46 4.30 4.56 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 948 5.00 3.86 3.95 4.03 5.00 Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 555 5.00 4.89 4.29 4.66 5.00 Seminar | 3. Was led | cture mat | erial presente | d and e | xplained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1564 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.41 | 5.00 |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1384 5.00 4.12 4.08 4.30 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.36 4.29 4.52 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1368 5.00 4.46 4.30 4.56 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 948 5.00 3.86 3.95 4.03 5.00 Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 555 5.00 4.89 4.29 4.66 5.00 Seminar | 4. Did the | e lecture | es contribute t | o what | you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1559 | 5.00 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.41 | 5.00 |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1384 5.00 4.12 4.08 4.30 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.36 4.29 4.52 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1368 5.00 4.46 4.30 4.56 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 948 5.00 3.86 3.95 4.03 5.00 Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 555 5.00 4.89 4.29 4.66 5.00 Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.36 4.29 4.52 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1368 5.00 4.46 4.30 4.56 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1/948 5.00 3.86 3.95 4.03 5.00 Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/555 5.00 4.89 4.29 4.66 5.00 Seminar | 1 Did ala | | | | | | | | Λ | Λ | Λ | 2 | 5 00 | 1/1384 | 5 00 | 4 12 | 4 08 | 4 30 | 5 00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1368 5.00 4.46 4.30 4.56 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 948 5.00 3.86 3.95 4.03 5.00 Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 555 5.00 4.89 4.29 4.66 5.00 Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1/948 5.00 3.86 3.95 4.03 5.00 Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/555 5.00 4.89 4.29 4.66 5.00 Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/555 5.00 4.89 4.29 4.66 5.00 Seminar | | | | | a open arbeablion | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/555 5.00 4.89 4.29 4.66 5.00 Seminar | | _ | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| * | 5. Were re | equiremer | nts for lab rep | orts cl | early specified | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/ 555 | 5.00 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.66 | 5.00 |
| | | | Semina | r | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 83/288 4.00 3.81 3.68 3.87 4.00 | 5. Were c | riteria f | for grading mad | e clear | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 83/ 288 | 4.00 | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.87 | 4.00 |
| Frequency Distribution | | | | | Freq | uency | / Dis | trib | utio: | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors | Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | | | Re | asons | 3 | | | Tv | pe | | | Maiors | : |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 0 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 1 | | | | | | | | | ed f | or Ma | ajors | 5 | 0 | Graduat | е | 0 | Majo | r | 1 |
| | | 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 | | | | | | nara | 1 | | | | 1 | IInder-a | rad | 2 | Non | .maior | 1 |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 | | | | | | | Τ. | | | | _ | onder-g. | Lau | 4 | NOI1- | illa JOE | Τ. |
| Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough | | | | | | | | | ves | | | | 0 | #### - 1 | Means t | here s | are not | enous | rh |
| P 0 responses to be significant | oraa. | Ü | 3.30 1.00 | J | - 0 | | | | | | | | - | | | | | _ | , |
| I 0 Other 1 | | | | | - 0 | | O+1 | her | | | | | 1 | _ CDPOID | L | .c bigi | | | |
| ? 0 | | | | | - * | | 00. | | | | | | _ | | | | | | |

Course-Section: HIST 701 0101 Title STUDY OF HISTORY

Instructor: KARS, MARJOLEIN

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1004 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| O verbiere e | 1 .TD | 377 | | _ | ncie | | - | | ructor | Course | _ | | | Sect |
|---|--------------|-----|---|---|------|---------|----|------|-----------|--------|-------|------|------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | - 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 4.53 | 617/1649 | 4.53 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.46 | 4.53 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | | 4.24 | 920/1648 | 4.24 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.34 | 4.24 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | ****/1375 | **** | 4.66 | 4.27 | 4.44 | **** |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 7 | | 1032/1595 | 4.06 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.35 | 4.06 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 4.29 | 584/1533 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.04 | 4.28 | 4.29 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 4.44 | 479/1512 | 4.44 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.35 | 4.44 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 3.71 | 1299/1623 | 3.71 | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.29 | 3.71 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 4.71 | 993/1646 | 4.71 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.81 | 4.71 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 4.25 | 687/1621 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.20 | 4.25 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lecture | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | _ | | _ | 4 45 | 004/1560 | 4 45 | 4 = 4 | 4 42 | 4 50 | 4 45 |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 4.47 | | 4.47 | 4.54 | | 4.52 | 4.47 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 4.94 | 355/1572 | 4.94 | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.83 | 4.94 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 8 | 4.29 | 897/1564 | 4.29 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.41 | 4.29 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Ţ | _ | 12 | 4.44 | , | 4.44 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.41 | 4.44 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 13 | 0 | Τ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/1352 | *** | 4.07 | 3.98 | 4.10 | *** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 4.47 | 468/1384 | 4.47 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.30 | 4.47 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 4.65 | 502/1382 | 4.65 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.52 | 4.65 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 4.47 | 683/1368 | 4.47 | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.56 | 4.47 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.00 | 844/ 948 | 3.00 | 3.86 | 3.95 | 4.03 | 3.00 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 5.00 | 1/ 555 | 5 00 | 4 89 | 4 29 | 4 66 | 5 00 |
| J. Were requirements for tab reports crearry specified | O | _ | O | U | O | O | 10 | 3.00 | 1/ 333 | 3.00 | 1.05 | 1.25 | 1.00 | 3.00 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 4.64 | 47/ 88 | 4.64 | 4.45 | 4.54 | 4.63 | 4.64 |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4.23 | 63/ 85 | 4.23 | 4.06 | 4.47 | 4.50 | 4.23 |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 4.54 | 39/ 81 | | 4.38 | 4.43 | 4.43 | 4.54 |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 4.46 | 46/ 92 | 4.46 | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.42 | 4.46 |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 4 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3.67 | 181/ 288 | 3.67 | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.87 | 3.67 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits E | Carned | Cum. GPA | | Expecte | ed Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | Majors | |
|-----------|--------|-----------|---|---------|-----------|---------------------|----|--------------|--------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 4 | 0.00-0.99 | 5 | А | 3 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 13 | Major | 16 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 12 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 4 | Non-major | 1 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | _ | | _ | |
| Grad. | 13 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | h |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 17 | - | | | |
| | | | | 2 | 1 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: HIST 703 0101

EUR. HISTORIOGRAPHY

Title Instructor: RITSCHEL, DANIE

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 11

Page 1005 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

| Questions | NR | NA | Fre | equer 2 | ncies 3 | 4 | 5 | Inst Mean | ructor Rank | Course Mean | Dept Mean | | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|--|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 8 | 4.82 4.73 | 265/1649 291/1648 | 4.82 4.73 | 4.46 4.38 | 4.28 4.23 | 4.46 4.34 | 4.82 4.73 |
| Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 0 0 | 9 1 0 | 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 | 0 1 0 | 0 5 1 | 1 4 10 | 5.00 4.30 4.91 | ****/1375 759/1595 106/1533 | **** 4.30 4.91 | 4.66 4.28 4.27 | 4.27 4.20 4.04 | 4.44 4.35 4.28 | **** 4.30 4.91 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned7. Was the grading system clearly explained8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 0 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 2 0 | 4 5 0 | 6 4 11 | 4.60 4.18 5.00 | 310/1512 894/1623 1/1646 | 4.60 4.18 5.00 | 4.29 4.38 4.76 | 4.10 4.16 4.69 | 4.35 4.29 4.81 | 4.60 4.18 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness Lecture | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | | 720/1621 | | 4.26 | 4.06 | | 4.22 |
| Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 1 1 1 | 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 | 3 0 3 2 | 7 10 7 8 | 4.70 5.00 4.70 4.80 | 588/1568 1/1572 434/1564 318/1559 | 4.70 5.00 4.70 4.80 | 4.54 4.84 4.46 4.48 | 4.43 4.70 4.28 4.29 | 4.52 4.83 4.41 4.41 | 4.70 5.00 4.70 4.80 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1352 201/1384 | **** 4.80 | 4.07 | 3.98 4.08 | 4.10 | **** 4.80 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 1 1 | 0 0 7 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 1 1 | 2 3 0 | 8 6 2 | 4.80 4.50 4.33 | 342/1382 654/1368 310/ 948 | 4.80 4.50 4.33 | 4.36 4.46 3.86 | 4.29 4.30 3.95 | 4.52 4.56 | 4.80 4.50 4.33 |
| Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/ 555 | 5.00 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.66 | 5.00 |
| Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 6 6 6 | 0 0 1 0 | 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 | 1 2 3 1 | 4 3 1 3 | 4.80 4.60 4.25 4.40 | 34/ 88 44/ 85 54/ 81 54/ 92 | 4.80 4.60 4.25 4.40 | 4.45 4.06 4.38 3.93 | 4.54 4.47 4.43 4.35 | 4.63 4.50 4.43 4.42 | 4.80 4.60 4.25 4.40 |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear Frequ | 4 iency | 0 Dist | 0 trib | 0 ution | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4.14 | 76/ 288 | 4.14 | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.87 | 4.14 |
| Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades | | | | Rea | asons | ; | | | Туј | pe | | | Majors | |
| 00-27 4 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 | | | quire nera: | | or Ma | jor | | 0 | Graduat | | 5 6 | Majo | r major | 9 |
| 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Grad. 5 3.50-4.00 6 F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 0 | | Ele | ectiv | | | | | 1 | #### - 1 respons | Means t | here a | re not | enoug | |

Course-Section: HIST 705 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO PUBLIC HIST Baltimore County

Instructor: MERINGOLO, DENI

Instructor: MERING
Enrollment: 11

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 9

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1006 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

| | | | Fre | eque | ncie | S | | Inst | tructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-----|------|------|---|--------|-------|-----------|--------------|------|------|--------------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | _ | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | Mean | | | Mean |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | _ | 4.56 | 577/1649 | 4 56 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 1 10 | 4.56 |
| Did you gain new insights, skills from this course Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 5 | 4.56 | 498/1648 | 4.56 4.56 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.46 4.34 | 4.56 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/1375 | 4.50 **** | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.34 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4.67 | 321/1595 | 4.67 | | 4.27 | 4.44 | 4.67 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4.22 | 653/1533 | 4.07 | 4.20 | 4.20 | 4.28 | 4.22 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4.22 | 723/1512 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.10 | 4.20 | 4.22 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.22 | 130/1623 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.35 | 4.22 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1646 | 5.00 | 4.76 | 4.10 | 4.29 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | _ | | 789/1621 | | | 4.09 | 4.20 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | U | U | U | U | 5 | 1 | 4.1/ | 709/1021 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.00 | 4.20 | 4.1/ |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 287/1568 | 4.88 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.52 | 4.88 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1572 | 5.00 | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.83 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4.67 | 473/1564 | 4.67 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.41 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 695/1559 | 4.50 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.41 | 4.50 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/1352 | **** | 4.07 | 3.98 | 4.10 | **** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Discussion | | | • | | _ | | _ | 4 = 0 | 000/1001 | 4 50 | | 4 00 | 4 00 | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 4.78 | 228/1384 | 4.78 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.30 | 4.78 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1382 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.52 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1368 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.56 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 948 | **** | 3.86 | 3.95 | 4.03 | **** |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/ 555 | 5.00 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.66 | 5.00 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | 51/ 88 | 4.57 | 4.45 | 4.54 | 4.63 | 4.57 |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 26/ 85 | 4.86 | 4.06 | 4.47 | 4.50 | 4.86 |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.14 | 58/ 81 | | 4.38 | 4.43 | 4.43 | 4.14 |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 30/ 92 | 4.71 | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.42 | 4.71 |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4.14 | 76/ 288 | 4.14 | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.87 | 4.14 |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 4.51 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 48 | **** | **** | 4.09 | 4.47 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.58 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.38 | 4.44 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | _ | 4.67 | 21/ 312 | 4.67 | | 3.68 | 3.83 | |
| J. Did conferences help you early out field detivities | 3 | _ | O | Ü | O | _ | | 1.07 | 21/ 312 | 1.07 | 1.00 | 3.00 | 3.03 | 1.07 |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | 5.00 | 4.30 | 4.37 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 30 | **** | 4.00 | 4.16 | 4.49 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 41 | *** | 5.00 | 4.43 | 4.43 | **** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: HIST 705 0101

Title INTRO PUBLIC HIST Instructor:

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County MERINGOLO, DENI Fall 2008

Page 1006 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits E | Tarned | Cum. GPA | • | Expected | l Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|-----------|--------|-----------|---|----------|----------|---------------------|---|--------------|--------|----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 6 | А | 7 | Required for Majors | 1 | Graduate | 7 | Major | 8 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 1 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 2 | Non-major | 1 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 7 | 3.50-4.00 | 0 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | L |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | nificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 7 | - | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: HIST 711 0101

Title PRACTICUM IN PUBL HIST

Instructor: LEE, STEVEN

Enrollment: 8
Questionnaires: 1

Fall 2008

Page 1007 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

| | | | Fre | equei | ncies | S | | Inst | tructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|------|------|------|-------|-------|---|---|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 1649/1649 | 1.00 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.46 | 1.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 1648/1648 | 1.00 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.34 | 1.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 1592/1595 | 1.00 | 4.28 | 4.20 | 4.35 | 1.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 1531/1533 | 1.00 | 4.27 | 4.04 | 4.28 | 1.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 1511/1512 | 1.00 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.35 | 1.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 1623/1623 | 1.00 | 4.38 | 4.16 | 4.29 | 1.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 1544/1646 | 4.00 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.81 | 4.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 1617/1621 | 1.00 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.20 | 1.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 00 | 1567/1568 | 1.00 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.52 | 1.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | 1556/1572 | 3.00 | 4.84 | 4.70 | 4.83 | 3.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 1563/1564 | 1.00 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.41 | 1.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 1557/1559 | 1.00 | 4.48 | 4.29 | | 1.00 |
| 5 . | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Discussion | _ | | _ | | | | | | | | | 4 00 | 4 00 | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 1366/1384 | | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.30 | 2.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 1374/1382 | 2.00 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.52 | 2.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | U | 2.00 | 1356/1368 | 2.00 | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.56 | 2.00 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 87/ 88 | 3.00 | 4.45 | 4.54 | 4.63 | 3.00 |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 85/ 85 | 1.00 | 4.06 | 4.47 | 4.50 | 1.00 |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 63/ 81 | 4.00 | 4.38 | 4.43 | 4.43 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | 91/ 92 | 2.00 | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.42 | 2.00 |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 283/ 288 | 1.00 | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.87 | 1.00 |
| Frequ | ency | Dist | trib | ution | า | | | | | | | | | |
| - | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

Course-Section: HIST 713 0101 University of Maryland Title SEMINAR IN SOCIAL HIST Baltimore County

SEMINAR IN SOCIAL HIST Baltimore County LINDENMEYER, KR Fall 2008

Instructor: LINDENMEYER, KR

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1008 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

| | | | | | | | Frequencies | | | | Instructor | | Course Dep | | UMBC | Level | Sect | |
|--|--|------------------|------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|----------------|---|------|------------|-----------|---|------|--------|-----------|------|------|
| Questions | | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | 965/1649 | 4.25 | 4.46 | 4.28 | 4.46 | 4.25 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | | 4.25 | | | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.34 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | | | | | | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | _ | 5.00 | 1/1375 | | 4.66 | 4.27 | | 5.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | | 4.25 | | | 4.28 | 4.20 | | 4.25 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | | | 1065/1533 | | 4.27 | 4.04 | 4.28 | 3.75 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 687/1512 | | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.35 | 4.25 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | | | | | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | | | 1462/1623 | | 4.38 | 4.16 | | 3.33 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1646 | 5.00 | 4.76 | 4.69 | 4.81 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | | | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 234/1621 | 4.67 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.20 | 4.67 |
| | | Logtur | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | 852/1568 | 4.50 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.52 | 4 50 |
| | | ctor seem inter | _ | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | | 931/1572 | | 4.84 | 4.43 | | 4.75 |
| | | cerial presented | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | | 939/1564 | | 4.46 | 4.28 | | 4.75 |
| | | es contribute to | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | | 695/1559 | | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.41 | |
| | | | | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | | 970/1352 | | | | | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | | | | | U | | U | U | 2 | U | _ | 3.07 | J10/1332 | 3.07 | 4.07 | 3.90 | 4.10 | 3.07 |
| | | Discuss | sion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.25 | 1192/1384 | 3.25 | 4.12 | 4.08 | 4.30 | 3.25 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | | | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2.75 | 1350/1382 | 2.75 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.52 | 2.75 | |
| | 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | | | open discussion | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.25 | 1252/1368 | 3.25 | 4.46 | 4.30 | 4.56 | 3.25 |
| 4. Were sp | 4. Were special techniques successful | | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | 844/ 948 | 3.00 | 3.86 | 3.95 | 4.03 | 3.00 | |
| | Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/ 555 | 5.00 | 4.89 | 4.29 | 4.66 | 5.00 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Seminar | | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | • | - | • | 4 00 | 02/000 | 4 00 | 2 01 | 2 60 | 2 05 | 4 00 | | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | | | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | U | 4.00 | 83/ 288 | 4.00 | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.87 | 4.00 | | |
| | | Field V | Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | | | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 68/ 312 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 3.68 | 3.83 | 4.00 | | |
| | | | | Frequ | encv | Dist | ribı | ıt i or | า | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | 11040 | ciicj | DID | | 10101 | - | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades | | | | Reasons | | | | | | | | Type | | | Majors | | | |
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A 2 | Requir | | | red for Majors | | | 3 | 0 | Graduat | :e 1 | | Major | | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | в 0 | | negatica for Majore | | | | | | | | | | 3 - | | - |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C 0 | General | | | | | | | 2 | Under-grad 3 | | | Non-major | | 4 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D 0 | | | | | | | | | 3 | - | | | 3 | |
| Grad. | | | | | | Electives | | | | | | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | | | |
| P 0 | | | | Other | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| I 0 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| | ? 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |