

Course-Section: HIST 101 1  
 Title American History To 18  
 Instructor: Bouton,Robert T  
 Enrollment: 76  
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 870  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	8	42	4.75	303/1509	4.55	4.53	4.31	4.18	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	40	4.73	278/1509	4.64	4.38	4.26	4.25	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	42	4.76	250/1287	4.73	4.49	4.30	4.24	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	4	10	36	4.59	367/1459	4.43	4.33	4.22	4.11	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	9	9	33	4.42	423/1406	4.38	4.38	4.09	4.02	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	10	9	29	4.30	570/1384	4.05	4.31	4.11	3.98	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	10	38	4.62	330/1489	4.59	4.34	4.17	4.20	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	0	1	11	25	4.65	222/1463	4.50	4.33	4.09	4.02	4.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	48	4.94	131/1438	4.85	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	50	4.98	108/1421	4.93	4.91	4.73	4.66	4.98
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	3	47	4.88	159/1411	4.79	4.57	4.31	4.27	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	48	4.92	137/1405	4.81	4.55	4.32	4.27	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	1	13	34	4.63	193/1236	4.68	4.17	4.00	3.87	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	2	1	3	6	12	4.04	732/1260	4.06	4.20	4.14	3.95	4.04
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	1	1	3	9	10	4.08	880/1255	4.13	4.36	4.33	4.15	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	1	0	3	10	10	4.17	867/1258	4.36	4.51	4.38	4.18	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	28	12	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	****/ 873	3.11	3.87	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	50	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	50	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	50	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 89	4.45	4.65	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	49	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.73	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	49	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.69	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	4.50	4.63	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	49	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 93	4.40	4.00	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	50	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	50	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	50	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	50	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: HIST 101 1  
 Title American History To 18  
 Instructor: Bouton,Robert T  
 Enrollment: 76  
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 870  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 2	A 19	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0 Major 5
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 18		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 8	General 25	Under-grad 52 Non-major 47
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 10	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	7	9	19	4.34	789/1509	4.55	4.53	4.31	4.18	4.34
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	6	24	4.54	495/1509	4.64	4.38	4.26	4.25	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	26	4.69	337/1287	4.73	4.49	4.30	4.24	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	1	15	12	4.28	748/1459	4.43	4.33	4.22	4.11	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	11	19	4.34	494/1406	4.38	4.38	4.09	4.02	4.34
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	2	6	13	7	3.79	1023/1384	4.05	4.31	4.11	3.98	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	13	21	4.57	376/1489	4.59	4.34	4.17	4.20	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	17	11	4.34	534/1463	4.50	4.33	4.09	4.02	4.34
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	27	4.76	430/1438	4.85	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	31	4.88	588/1421	4.93	4.91	4.73	4.66	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	8	25	4.71	363/1411	4.79	4.57	4.31	4.27	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	26	4.71	406/1405	4.81	4.55	4.32	4.27	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	5	27	4.74	137/1236	4.68	4.17	4.00	3.87	4.74
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	3	4	8	12	4.07	722/1260	4.06	4.20	4.14	3.95	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	6	6	14	4.19	828/1255	4.13	4.36	4.33	4.15	4.19
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	2	5	19	4.56	584/1258	4.36	4.51	4.38	4.18	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	8	8	5	1	4	5	4	3.11	792/ 873	3.11	3.87	4.03	3.89	3.11
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	60/ 89	4.45	4.65	4.49	4.31	4.45
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	5	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/ 92	****	4.73	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	5	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/ 90	****	4.69	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	47/ 92	4.50	4.63	4.38	4.21	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	40/ 93	4.40	4.00	4.06	3.92	4.40
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: HIST 101 2  
 Title American History To 18  
 Instructor: Lindenmeyer, Kri  
 Enrollment: 62  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 871  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	2	A	12	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	18	Under-grad	35	Non-major	32
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HIST 102 1  
 Title Amer Hist Since 1877  
 Instructor: Smead,Howard  
 Enrollment: 46  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 872  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	351/1509	4.63	4.53	4.31	4.18	4.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	201/1509	4.71	4.38	4.26	4.25	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	19	4.76	250/1287	4.76	4.49	4.30	4.24	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1459	4.78	4.33	4.22	4.11	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	6	13	4.33	502/1406	4.28	4.38	4.09	4.02	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/1384	4.28	4.31	4.11	3.98	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	8	17	4.68	265/1489	4.61	4.34	4.17	4.20	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	2	20	2	4.00	1383/1506	4.13	4.75	4.67	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	9	13	4.59	255/1463	4.56	4.33	4.09	4.02	4.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	110/1438	4.90	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	269/1421	4.91	4.91	4.73	4.66	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	255/1411	4.80	4.57	4.31	4.27	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	205/1405	4.84	4.55	4.32	4.27	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	158/1236	4.65	4.17	4.00	3.87	4.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	597/1260	4.12	4.20	4.14	3.95	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	762/1255	4.45	4.36	4.33	4.15	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	700/1258	4.49	4.51	4.38	4.18	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	18	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 873	3.53	3.87	4.03	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 5	C 1	General 13	Under-grad 25 Non-major 23
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: HIST 102 2  
 Title Amer Hist Since 1877  
 Instructor: Scott,Michelle  
 Enrollment: 49  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 873  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	10	19	4.55	551/1509	4.63	4.53	4.31	4.18	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	9	21	4.61	412/1509	4.71	4.38	4.26	4.25	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	5	24	4.77	250/1287	4.76	4.49	4.30	4.24	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	11	18	4.57	389/1459	4.78	4.33	4.22	4.11	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	4	9	15	4.23	611/1406	4.28	4.38	4.09	4.02	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	1	2	10	15	4.28	599/1384	4.28	4.31	4.11	3.98	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	5	4	21	4.53	422/1489	4.61	4.34	4.17	4.20	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	20	9	4.27	1251/1506	4.13	4.75	4.67	4.66	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	11	16	4.54	301/1463	4.56	4.33	4.09	4.02	4.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	26	4.84	319/1438	4.90	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	27	4.87	614/1421	4.91	4.91	4.73	4.66	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	26	4.81	243/1411	4.80	4.57	4.31	4.27	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	25	4.81	285/1405	4.84	4.55	4.32	4.27	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	9	21	4.61	205/1236	4.65	4.17	4.00	3.87	4.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	6	4	7	3.94	819/1260	4.12	4.20	4.14	3.95	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	494/1255	4.45	4.36	4.33	4.15	4.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	584/1258	4.49	4.51	4.38	4.18	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	4	4	2	5	3.53	694/ 873	3.53	3.87	4.03	3.89	3.53

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 1	B 12		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 4	C 1	General 13	Under-grad 33 Non-major 33
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Course-Section: HIST 103 1  
 Title East-Asian Civilizatio  
 Instructor: Vaporis,Constan  
 Enrollment: 76  
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 874  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	9	14	18	4.00	1114/1509	4.26	4.53	4.31	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	7	11	17	9	3.64	1318/1509	4.13	4.38	4.26	4.25	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	10	19	12	3.82	1064/1287	4.32	4.49	4.30	4.24	3.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	15	15	12	3.78	1182/1459	4.07	4.33	4.22	4.11	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	5	13	22	4.18	665/1406	4.33	4.38	4.09	4.02	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	3	9	16	12	3.66	1114/1384	3.95	4.31	4.11	3.98	3.66
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	5	10	16	13	3.84	1148/1489	4.08	4.34	4.17	4.20	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	38	4.86	662/1506	4.91	4.75	4.67	4.66	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	3	2	13	17	4	3.44	1278/1463	3.83	4.33	4.09	4.02	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	3	16	24	4.38	960/1438	4.55	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	5	10	30	4.56	1123/1421	4.78	4.91	4.73	4.66	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	4	12	13	15	3.82	1178/1411	4.23	4.57	4.31	4.27	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	2	10	8	20	3.80	1177/1405	4.31	4.55	4.32	4.27	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	3	4	4	16	17	3.91	774/1236	4.29	4.17	4.00	3.87	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	5	8	8	6	3	2.80	1206/1260	3.42	4.20	4.14	3.95	2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	4	6	13	3	4	2.90	1224/1255	3.64	4.36	4.33	4.15	2.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	4	4	7	8	7	3.33	1184/1258	3.98	4.51	4.38	4.18	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	15	23	3	1	2	1	0	2.14	****/ 873	3.27	3.87	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	41	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	42	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 89	****	4.65	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	42	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.73	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 90	****	4.69	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 93	****	4.00	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	42	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	1	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: HIST 103 1  
 Title East-Asian Civilizatio  
 Instructor: Vaporis,Constan  
 Enrollment: 76  
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 874  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	5	A	4	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	15	General	28	Under-grad	45	Non-major	39
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	4						

Course-Section: HIST 103 2  
 Title East-Asian Civilizatio  
 Instructor: Oakes,Julie Chr  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 875  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	6	19	4.52	586/1509	4.26	4.53	4.31	4.18	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	11	18	4.62	401/1509	4.13	4.38	4.26	4.25	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	191/1287	4.32	4.49	4.30	4.24	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	14	12	4.36	667/1459	4.07	4.33	4.22	4.11	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	11	16	4.48	354/1406	4.33	4.38	4.09	4.02	4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	14	11	4.24	629/1384	3.95	4.31	4.11	3.98	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	10	14	4.31	696/1489	4.08	4.34	4.17	4.20	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	233/1506	4.91	4.75	4.67	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	2	13	7	4.23	658/1463	3.83	4.33	4.09	4.02	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	8	21	4.72	497/1438	4.55	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1421	4.78	4.91	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	10	18	4.64	442/1411	4.23	4.57	4.31	4.27	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	24	4.83	262/1405	4.31	4.55	4.32	4.27	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	170/1236	4.29	4.17	4.00	3.87	4.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	4	5	10	4.05	732/1260	3.42	4.20	4.14	3.95	4.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	1	4	14	4.38	681/1255	3.64	4.36	4.33	4.15	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	542/1258	3.98	4.51	4.38	4.18	4.62
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	1	1	9	1	3	3.27	769/ 873	3.27	3.87	4.03	3.89	3.27
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 89	****	4.65	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 92	****	4.73	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 90	****	4.69	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.00	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: HIST 103 2  
 Title East-Asian Civilizatio  
 Instructor: Oakes,Julie Chr  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 875  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	14	Under-grad	29	Non-major	22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 110 1  
 Title Western Civ To 1700  
 Instructor: Birkenmeier, Joh  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 876  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	800/1509	4.33	4.53	4.31	4.18	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	8	9	4.19	922/1509	4.19	4.38	4.26	4.25	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	1	9	9	4.30	739/1287	4.30	4.49	4.30	4.24	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	4	10	5	4.05	945/1459	4.05	4.33	4.22	4.11	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	6	8	7	4.05	783/1406	4.05	4.38	4.09	4.02	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	2	11	7	4.25	619/1384	4.25	4.31	4.11	3.98	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	10	9	4.33	674/1489	4.33	4.34	4.17	4.20	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	1054/1506	4.52	4.75	4.67	4.66	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	10	4	4.06	826/1463	4.06	4.33	4.09	4.02	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	131/1438	4.95	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.91	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	327/1411	4.74	4.57	4.31	4.27	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	369/1405	4.74	4.55	4.32	4.27	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	193/1236	4.63	4.17	4.00	3.87	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	718/1260	4.08	4.20	4.14	3.95	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	783/1255	4.25	4.36	4.33	4.15	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	710/1258	4.42	4.51	4.38	4.18	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	11	10	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 873	****	3.87	4.03	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 12	Under-grad 23	Non-major 22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: HIST 111 1  
 Title Western Civ Since 1700  
 Instructor: Laurie, Clayton  
 Enrollment: 56  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 877  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	1	0	3	15	16	4.29	852/1509	4.28	4.53	4.31	4.18	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	4	12	18	4.34	763/1509	4.28	4.38	4.26	4.25	4.34
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	2	4	9	20	4.34	698/1287	4.41	4.49	4.30	4.24	4.34
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	2	0	1	7	11	14	4.15	868/1459	4.00	4.33	4.22	4.11	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	8	10	17	4.26	587/1406	4.06	4.38	4.09	4.02	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	7	9	16	4.06	779/1384	3.84	4.31	4.11	3.98	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	2	11	21	4.49	485/1489	4.38	4.34	4.17	4.20	4.49
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	14	21	4.60	990/1506	4.80	4.75	4.67	4.66	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	0	17	13	4.43	424/1463	4.38	4.33	4.09	4.02	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	0	9	25	4.63	646/1438	4.75	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	34	4.97	161/1421	4.97	4.91	4.73	4.66	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	12	21	4.51	604/1411	4.49	4.57	4.31	4.27	4.51
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	0	11	22	4.51	624/1405	4.63	4.55	4.32	4.27	4.51
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	1	4	11	17	4.24	504/1236	4.24	4.17	4.00	3.87	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	746/1260	3.98	4.20	4.14	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	2	0	4	1	5	3.58	1108/1255	3.99	4.36	4.33	4.15	3.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	867/1258	4.21	4.51	4.38	4.18	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	27	6	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	****/ 873	****	3.87	4.03	3.89	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.65	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.73	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.69	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.00	4.06	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 15	Graduate	0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	39
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0	Other	1
			I 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			? 1		

Course-Section: HIST 111 2  
 Title Western Civ Since 1700  
 Instructor: Grubb,James S  
 Enrollment: 80  
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 878  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	21	15	4.28	862/1509	4.28	4.53	4.31	4.18	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	15	18	4.22	891/1509	4.28	4.38	4.26	4.25	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	12	24	4.47	554/1287	4.41	4.49	4.30	4.24	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	2	12	14	10	3.84	1135/1459	4.00	4.33	4.22	4.11	3.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	13	14	11	3.87	956/1406	4.06	4.38	4.09	4.02	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	3	12	14	7	3.62	1132/1384	3.84	4.31	4.11	3.98	3.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	3	13	20	4.28	728/1489	4.38	4.34	4.17	4.20	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	39	5.00	1/1506	4.80	4.75	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	0	2	14	11	4.33	545/1463	4.38	4.33	4.09	4.02	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	35	4.88	262/1438	4.75	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	37	4.97	161/1421	4.97	4.91	4.73	4.66	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	16	22	4.47	653/1411	4.49	4.57	4.31	4.27	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	32	4.75	345/1405	4.63	4.55	4.32	4.27	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	7	10	18	4.25	489/1236	4.24	4.17	4.00	3.87	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	7	12	9	3.97	795/1260	3.98	4.20	4.14	3.95	3.97
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	1	3	4	19	4.39	673/1255	3.99	4.36	4.33	4.15	4.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	4	6	16	4.25	818/1258	4.21	4.51	4.38	4.18	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	13	18	4	3	2	1	0	2.00	****/ 873	****	3.87	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 20		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 20	Under-grad 41 Non-major 39
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 5	### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 1		

Course-Section: HIST 200 1  
 Title Themes In World Histor  
 Instructor: Ritschel, Daniel  
 Enrollment: 69  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 879  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	8	15	19	4.02	1100/1509	4.02	4.53	4.31	4.34	4.02
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	11	14	17	3.89	1170/1509	3.89	4.38	4.26	4.32	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	5	10	12	16	3.78	1084/1287	3.78	4.49	4.30	4.35	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	11	18	15	3.98	1011/1459	3.98	4.33	4.22	4.30	3.98
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	9	14	19	3.98	849/1406	3.98	4.38	4.09	4.09	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	11	18	12	3.82	1001/1384	3.82	4.31	4.11	4.09	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	4	17	22	4.31	696/1489	4.31	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	6	39	4.87	662/1506	4.87	4.75	4.67	4.61	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	1	0	7	14	10	4.00	853/1463	4.00	4.33	4.09	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	3	10	29	4.56	737/1438	4.56	4.68	4.46	4.48	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	8	36	4.82	768/1421	4.82	4.91	4.73	4.76	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	6	14	23	4.34	799/1411	4.34	4.57	4.31	4.37	4.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	2	10	28	4.39	778/1405	4.39	4.55	4.32	4.39	4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	3	3	5	9	23	4.07	635/1236	4.07	4.17	4.00	4.11	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	4	10	14	4.28	605/1260	4.28	4.20	4.14	4.19	4.28
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	3	3	3	7	13	3.83	1028/1255	3.83	4.36	4.33	4.37	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	2	0	2	7	18	4.34	763/1258	4.34	4.51	4.38	4.44	4.34
4. Were special techniques successful	17	12	1	2	4	4	6	3.71	636/ 873	3.71	3.87	4.03	4.04	3.71
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.65	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.73	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	4.69	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.00	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: HIST 200 1  
 Title Themes In World Histor  
 Instructor: Ritschel, Daniel  
 Enrollment: 69  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 879  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A	12	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	1	Major	15
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	18						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	9	Under-grad	45	Non-major	31
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Course-Section: HIST 201 1  
 Title Intro To Study Of Hist  
 Instructor: McDonough,Susan  
 Enrollment: 61  
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 880  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	3	8	13	12	3.94	1174/1509	4.43	4.53	4.31	4.34	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	5	4	24	4.36	742/1509	4.64	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	25	0	2	0	1	7	4.30	739/1287	4.65	4.49	4.30	4.35	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	2	5	11	16	4.21	826/1459	4.51	4.33	4.22	4.30	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	7	6	9	12	3.69	1093/1406	4.25	4.38	4.09	4.09	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	3	6	23	4.47	376/1384	4.69	4.31	4.11	4.09	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	6	26	4.63	319/1489	4.77	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	34	4.97	175/1506	4.94	4.75	4.67	4.61	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	1	0	2	13	10	4.19	690/1463	4.45	4.33	4.09	4.08	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	5	26	4.63	646/1438	4.81	4.68	4.46	4.48	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	4	2	28	4.71	968/1421	4.85	4.91	4.73	4.76	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	5	9	21	4.46	677/1411	4.68	4.57	4.31	4.37	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	4	6	4	20	4.18	954/1405	4.54	4.55	4.32	4.39	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	2	3	6	11	9	3.71	883/1236	4.04	4.17	4.00	4.11	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	7	9	7	3.92	856/1260	4.36	4.20	4.14	4.19	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	6	1	17	4.46	620/1255	4.67	4.36	4.33	4.37	4.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	4	3	17	4.54	591/1258	4.77	4.51	4.38	4.44	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	1	1	6	7	5	3.70	636/ 873	3.79	3.87	4.03	4.04	3.70
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.65	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.73	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	4.69	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.00	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: HIST 201 1  
 Title Intro To Study Of Hist  
 Instructor: McDonough, Susan  
 Enrollment: 61  
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 880  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	31	Graduate	0	Major	30
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	15						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	37	Non-major	7
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	159/1509	4.43	4.53	4.31	4.34	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	116/1509	4.64	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1287	4.65	4.49	4.30	4.35	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	141/1459	4.51	4.33	4.22	4.30	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	130/1406	4.25	4.38	4.09	4.09	4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	71/1384	4.69	4.31	4.11	4.09	4.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	92/1489	4.77	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	583/1506	4.94	4.75	4.67	4.61	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	190/1463	4.45	4.33	4.09	4.08	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1438	4.81	4.68	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1421	4.85	4.91	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	138/1411	4.68	4.57	4.31	4.37	4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	172/1405	4.54	4.55	4.32	4.39	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	0	0	9	4.36	392/1236	4.04	4.17	4.00	4.11	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	209/1260	4.36	4.20	4.14	4.19	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	221/1255	4.67	4.36	4.33	4.37	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1258	4.77	4.51	4.38	4.44	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	1	1	0	5	3.88	550/ 873	3.79	3.87	4.03	4.04	3.88
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.65	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.73	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.69	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.00	4.06	2.88	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 273 1  
 Title Hist Of Jews:Modrn Tim  
 Instructor: Katz,David  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 882  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	1	11	18	4.30	833/1509	4.30	4.53	4.31	4.34	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	7	8	13	3.82	1221/1509	3.82	4.38	4.26	4.32	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	0	4	8	17	4.23	803/1287	4.23	4.49	4.30	4.35	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	814/1459	4.21	4.33	4.22	4.30	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	9	19	4.33	502/1406	4.33	4.38	4.09	4.09	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	1	2	2	1	9	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.31	4.11	4.09	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	2	2	4	6	17	4.10	923/1489	4.10	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	1	13	16	4.50	1070/1506	4.50	4.75	4.67	4.61	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	3	1	2	15	7	3.79	1076/1463	3.79	4.33	4.09	4.08	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	2	2	3	22	4.22	1102/1438	4.22	4.68	4.46	4.48	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	0	30	4.88	614/1421	4.88	4.91	4.73	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	2	1	8	17	4.00	1051/1411	4.00	4.57	4.31	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	0	8	19	4.22	926/1405	4.22	4.55	4.32	4.39	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	25	2	2	0	1	1	2.50	****/1236	****	4.17	4.00	4.11	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	5	1	2	7	4	3.21	1130/1260	3.21	4.20	4.14	4.19	3.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	5	3	5	4	2	2.74	1232/1255	2.74	4.36	4.33	4.37	2.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	5	1	5	5	3	3.00	1222/1258	3.00	4.51	4.38	4.44	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	14	13	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	****/ 873	****	3.87	4.03	4.04	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.65	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.73	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.69	4.50	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	17	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	14	Under-grad	33	Non-major	27
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HIST 304 1  
 Title U.S. & Vietnam War  
 Instructor: Laurie, Clayton  
 Enrollment: 114  
 Questionnaires: 81

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 883  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	0	0	16	62	4.75	315/1509	4.75	4.53	4.31	4.32	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	13	61	4.70	322/1509	4.70	4.38	4.26	4.25	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	2	12	63	4.74	272/1287	4.74	4.49	4.30	4.33	4.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	1	1	9	11	54	4.53	432/1459	4.53	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	2	8	15	50	4.37	470/1406	4.37	4.38	4.09	4.12	4.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	2	8	16	48	4.31	570/1384	4.31	4.31	4.11	4.15	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	6	16	55	4.64	308/1489	4.64	4.34	4.17	4.14	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	1	0	0	2	74	4.92	466/1506	4.92	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	1	2	22	44	4.53	309/1463	4.53	4.33	4.09	4.08	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	8	68	4.89	233/1438	4.89	4.68	4.46	4.43	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	74	4.97	161/1421	4.97	4.91	4.73	4.73	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	3	9	64	4.80	243/1411	4.80	4.57	4.31	4.29	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	1	5	69	4.91	172/1405	4.91	4.55	4.32	4.32	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	3	15	7	48	4.37	392/1236	4.37	4.17	4.00	4.07	4.37
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	37	0	3	2	6	13	20	4.02	739/1260	4.02	4.20	4.14	4.22	4.02
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	37	0	1	0	4	5	34	4.61	494/1255	4.61	4.36	4.33	4.37	4.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	37	0	0	0	3	6	35	4.73	456/1258	4.73	4.51	4.38	4.42	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	36	28	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	****/ 873	****	3.87	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	77	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	77	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	77	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	77	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	77	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	77	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.65	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	77	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.73	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	77	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 90	****	4.69	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	77	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	77	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 93	****	4.00	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	77	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	78	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	78	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	78	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	78	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	77	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	77	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	77	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	77	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	77	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: HIST 304 1  
 Title U.S. & Vietnam War  
 Instructor: Laurie, Clayton  
 Enrollment: 114  
 Questionnaires: 81

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 883  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	A	27	Required for Majors	30	Graduate	1	Major	29
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	30						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	8	General	9	Under-grad	80	Non-major	52
84-150	24	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	28	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	4	4	8	10	3.81	1280/1509	3.81	4.53	4.31	4.32	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	7	10	3.85	1196/1509	3.85	4.38	4.26	4.25	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	3	5	13	3.85	1047/1287	3.85	4.49	4.30	4.33	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	5	5	5	10	3.69	1222/1459	3.69	4.33	4.22	4.26	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	5	4	16	4.26	587/1406	4.26	4.38	4.09	4.12	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	4	3	5	13	4.08	762/1384	4.08	4.31	4.11	4.15	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	6	7	9	3.77	1193/1489	3.77	4.34	4.17	4.14	3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	18	6	4.15	1320/1506	4.15	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	4	14	3	3.78	1076/1463	3.78	4.33	4.09	4.08	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	7	7	11	4.08	1182/1438	4.08	4.68	4.46	4.43	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	898/1421	4.74	4.91	4.73	4.73	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	7	8	11	4.15	964/1411	4.15	4.57	4.31	4.29	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	3	9	11	4.08	1014/1405	4.08	4.55	4.32	4.32	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	2	4	10	6	3.67	904/1236	3.67	4.17	4.00	4.07	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	2	9	9	4.09	715/1260	4.09	4.20	4.14	4.22	4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	547/1255	4.55	4.36	4.33	4.37	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	670/1258	4.45	4.51	4.38	4.42	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	2	1	4	7	3	3.47	714/ 873	3.47	3.87	4.03	4.08	3.47
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.65	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.73	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.69	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 93	****	4.00	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 14	Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C 4	Major 8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	General 3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Under-grad 27
				P 0	Non-major 19
					Electives 13
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	1
?	0		

Course-Section: HIST 355 1  
 Title Selected Topics In His  
 Instructor: Birkenmeier, Joh  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 885  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	210/1509	4.83	4.53	4.31	4.32	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	167/1509	4.45	4.38	4.26	4.25	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	5	19	4.64	381/1287	4.64	4.49	4.30	4.33	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	291/1459	4.33	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	5	16	4.40	446/1406	4.56	4.38	4.09	4.12	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	7	17	4.71	191/1384	4.38	4.31	4.11	4.15	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	19	4.69	243/1489	4.32	4.34	4.17	4.14	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	15	4.58	1014/1506	4.62	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	151/1463	4.38	4.33	4.09	4.08	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	21	4.73	480/1438	4.47	4.68	4.46	4.43	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	215/1421	4.98	4.91	4.73	4.73	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	10	15	4.54	580/1411	4.32	4.57	4.31	4.29	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	194/1405	4.47	4.55	4.32	4.32	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	1	2	7	10	4.14	580/1236	4.19	4.17	4.00	4.07	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	402/1260	4.51	4.20	4.14	4.22	4.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	246/1255	4.71	4.36	4.33	4.37	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	2	18	4.76	409/1258	4.54	4.51	4.38	4.42	4.76
4. Were special techniques successful	5	14	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	731/ 873	3.64	3.87	4.03	4.08	3.43

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	26	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	9	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	244/1509	4.83	4.53	4.31	4.32	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	8	4	9	4.05	1056/1509	4.45	4.38	4.26	4.25	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	18	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1287	4.64	4.49	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	5	7	7	4.00	979/1459	4.33	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	187/1406	4.56	4.38	4.09	4.12	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	6	9	4.05	784/1384	4.38	4.31	4.11	4.15	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	5	5	8	3.95	1046/1489	4.32	4.34	4.17	4.14	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	941/1506	4.62	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	12	3	4.00	853/1463	4.38	4.33	4.09	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	3	3	11	4.21	1102/1438	4.47	4.68	4.46	4.43	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1421	4.98	4.91	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	2	5	9	4.11	992/1411	4.32	4.57	4.31	4.29	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	3	4	10	4.05	1024/1405	4.47	4.55	4.32	4.32	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	504/1236	4.19	4.17	4.00	4.07	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	415/1260	4.51	4.20	4.14	4.22	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	533/1255	4.71	4.36	4.33	4.37	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	784/1258	4.54	4.51	4.38	4.42	4.31
4. Were special techniques successful	5	9	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	560/ 873	3.64	3.87	4.03	4.08	3.86
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	54/ 89	4.63	4.65	4.49	4.86	4.63
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	73/ 92	4.00	4.73	4.54	4.67	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	47/ 90	4.63	4.69	4.50	4.63	4.63
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	25/ 92	4.75	4.63	4.38	4.73	4.75
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	1	2	3	1	1	2.88	84/ 93	2.88	4.00	4.06	3.94	2.88
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	21	Non-major	19
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 387 1  
 Title Med/Health Care In Chi  
 Instructor: Yip,Ka-che  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 887  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	5	23	4.53	563/1509	4.53	4.53	4.31	4.32	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	6	21	4.41	699/1509	4.41	4.38	4.26	4.25	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	4	25	4.68	348/1287	4.68	4.49	4.30	4.33	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	1	3	1	12	4.41	602/1459	4.41	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	0	5	9	14	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.38	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	1	5	3	14	4.17	701/1384	4.17	4.31	4.11	4.15	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	4	22	4.41	597/1489	4.41	4.34	4.17	4.14	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	4	13	10	4.14	750/1463	4.14	4.33	4.09	4.08	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	27	4.87	276/1438	4.87	4.68	4.46	4.43	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	28	4.90	537/1421	4.90	4.91	4.73	4.73	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	4	2	23	4.53	580/1411	4.53	4.57	4.31	4.29	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	1	5	22	4.62	513/1405	4.62	4.55	4.32	4.32	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	2	3	3	7	10	3.80	824/1236	3.80	4.17	4.00	4.07	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	4	1	1	4	7	3.53	1038/1260	3.53	4.20	4.14	4.22	3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	3	1	5	6	3.59	1108/1255	3.59	4.36	4.33	4.37	3.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	2	0	4	5	6	3.76	1067/1258	3.76	4.51	4.38	4.42	3.76
4. Were special techniques successful	15	13	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 873	****	3.87	4.03	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.65	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.73	4.54	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 15	Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C 2	Major 11
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D 0	Under-grad 32
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Non-major 21
				P 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				I 0	
				Other 0	
				? 1	

Course-Section: HIST 419 1  
 Title Demcratzng Amer 1815-5  
 Instructor: Rubin,Anne S  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 888  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	8	14	4.44	673/1509	4.44	4.53	4.31	4.39	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	13	4.36	742/1509	4.36	4.38	4.26	4.26	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	453/1287	4.57	4.49	4.30	4.38	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	11	12	4.40	619/1459	4.40	4.33	4.22	4.32	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	238/1406	4.64	4.38	4.09	4.11	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	8	13	4.36	492/1384	4.36	4.31	4.11	4.23	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	9	15	4.63	319/1489	4.63	4.34	4.17	4.18	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	13	4.52	1054/1506	4.52	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	545/1463	4.33	4.33	4.09	4.18	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	574/1438	4.68	4.68	4.46	4.50	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.91	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	303/1411	4.75	4.57	4.31	4.35	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	419/1405	4.70	4.55	4.32	4.34	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	5	10	8	4.04	644/1236	4.04	4.17	4.00	4.03	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	1	6	11	4.25	621/1260	4.25	4.20	4.14	4.25	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	629/1255	4.45	4.36	4.33	4.46	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	299/1258	4.85	4.51	4.38	4.51	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	5	16	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 873	****	3.87	4.03	4.26	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.65	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.73	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	4.69	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.00	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.33	****

Course-Section: HIST 419 1  
 Title Demcratzng Amer 1815-5  
 Instructor: Rubin, Anne S  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 888  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	2	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	23	Non-major	15
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HIST 421 1  
 Title The American Civil War  
 Instructor: Rubin, Anne S  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 889  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	470/1509	4.61	4.53	4.31	4.39	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	6	8	4.06	1049/1509	4.06	4.38	4.26	4.26	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	6	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	803/1287	4.22	4.49	4.30	4.38	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	3	7	3.72	1207/1459	3.72	4.33	4.22	4.32	3.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	502/1406	4.33	4.38	4.09	4.11	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	6	8	3.94	886/1384	3.94	4.31	4.11	4.23	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	906/1489	4.11	4.34	4.17	4.18	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	350/1506	4.94	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	2	8	2	3.85	1029/1463	3.85	4.33	4.09	4.18	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	737/1438	4.56	4.68	4.46	4.50	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.91	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	416/1411	4.67	4.57	4.31	4.35	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	2	13	4.39	778/1405	4.39	4.55	4.32	4.34	4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	1	5	10	4.22	512/1236	4.22	4.17	4.00	4.03	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	2	2	10	4.13	701/1260	4.13	4.20	4.14	4.25	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	3	12	4.47	602/1255	4.47	4.36	4.33	4.46	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	480/1258	4.71	4.51	4.38	4.51	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	3	3	4	1	5	3.13	789/ 873	3.13	3.87	4.03	4.26	3.13

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	2	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	4	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	1				
			? 0						

Course-Section: HIST 443 1  
 Title The U.S. Since 1945  
 Instructor: Smead,Howard  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 890  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	7	19	4.57	516/1509	4.57	4.53	4.31	4.39	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	10	15	4.39	709/1509	4.39	4.38	4.26	4.26	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	20	26	4.64	381/1287	4.64	4.49	4.30	4.38	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	0	4	8	9	4.09	917/1459	4.09	4.33	4.22	4.32	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	19	4.54	313/1406	4.54	4.38	4.09	4.11	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	7	4	16	4.25	619/1384	4.25	4.31	4.11	4.23	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	5	5	17	4.44	541/1489	4.44	4.34	4.17	4.18	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	22	4	4.11	1340/1506	4.11	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	11	10	4.29	588/1463	4.29	4.33	4.09	4.18	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	291/1438	4.85	4.68	4.46	4.50	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	768/1421	4.81	4.91	4.73	4.76	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	508/1411	4.59	4.57	4.31	4.35	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	19	4.59	549/1405	4.59	4.55	4.32	4.34	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	9	16	4.54	255/1236	4.54	4.17	4.00	4.03	4.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	5	3	8	4.00	746/1260	4.00	4.20	4.14	4.25	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	5	1	9	3.94	956/1255	3.94	4.36	4.33	4.46	3.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	861/1258	4.18	4.51	4.38	4.51	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	11	12	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/ 873	****	3.87	4.03	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 19	Graduate	1	Major	15
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 16					
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major 13
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D 0					
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives	7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	0			
				? 0					

Course-Section: HIST 445 1  
 Title History Of Science  
 Instructor: Tatarewicz,Jose  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 891  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	5	3	3	9	3.55	1387/1509	3.55	4.53	4.31	4.39	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	6	5	0	6	2.90	1483/1509	2.90	4.38	4.26	4.26	2.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	5	4	5	5	3.29	1215/1287	3.29	4.49	4.30	4.38	3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	3	2	5	4	4	3.22	1392/1459	3.22	4.33	4.22	4.32	3.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	4	4	9	3.64	1122/1406	3.64	4.38	4.09	4.11	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	3	4	4	6	3.35	1256/1384	3.35	4.31	4.11	4.23	3.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	7	4	1	3	3	2.50	1463/1489	2.50	4.34	4.17	4.18	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	10	4.45	1118/1506	4.45	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	3	5	7	2	3	2.85	1416/1463	2.85	4.33	4.09	4.18	2.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	3	9	3	5	3.38	1383/1438	3.38	4.68	4.46	4.50	3.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	1	19	4.76	863/1421	4.76	4.91	4.73	4.76	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	5	10	1	4	3.10	1354/1411	3.10	4.57	4.31	4.35	3.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	9	2	3	3	2.62	1385/1405	2.62	4.55	4.32	4.34	2.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	3	3	6	2	7	3.33	1056/1236	3.33	4.17	4.00	4.03	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	4	0	3	0	4	3.00	1162/1260	3.00	4.20	4.14	4.25	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	3	2	0	1	5	3.27	1177/1255	3.27	4.36	4.33	4.46	3.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	904/1258	4.09	4.51	4.38	4.51	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	11	9	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 873	****	3.87	4.03	4.26	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.65	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.73	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.69	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 93	****	4.00	4.06	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0	Major 12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B 4			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 22	Non-major 10
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 14			

Course-Section: HIST 470 1  
 Title Tudor & Stuart England  
 Instructor: Froide, Amy M.  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 892  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	5	26	4.78	267/1509	4.78	4.53	4.31	4.39	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	0	4	27	4.78	223/1509	4.78	4.38	4.26	4.26	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	1	0	4	26	4.77	240/1287	4.77	4.49	4.30	4.38	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	1	3	4	23	4.58	367/1459	4.58	4.33	4.22	4.32	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	7	22	4.59	275/1406	4.59	4.38	4.09	4.11	4.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	8	23	4.69	208/1384	4.69	4.31	4.11	4.23	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	2	5	23	4.50	458/1489	4.50	4.34	4.17	4.18	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	8	23	4.74	858/1506	4.74	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	1	10	18	4.47	381/1463	4.47	4.33	4.09	4.18	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	30	4.94	153/1438	4.94	4.68	4.46	4.50	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.91	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	27	4.81	232/1411	4.81	4.57	4.31	4.35	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	2	28	4.84	251/1405	4.84	4.55	4.32	4.34	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	0	2	5	4	13	4.17	563/1236	4.17	4.17	4.00	4.03	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	3	2	19	4.56	377/1260	4.56	4.20	4.14	4.25	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	254/1255	4.84	4.36	4.33	4.46	4.84
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	189/1258	4.92	4.51	4.38	4.51	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	1	1	4	8	9	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	3.87	4.03	4.26	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	1	Major	26
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	24						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	34	Non-major	9
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 479 1  
 Title China, 1912 To 1949  
 Instructor: Yip,Ka-che  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 893  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	23	4.67	410/1509	4.67	4.53	4.31	4.39	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	10	17	4.47	605/1509	4.47	4.38	4.26	4.26	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	8	17	4.40	638/1287	4.40	4.49	4.30	4.38	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	2	4	3	13	4.09	924/1459	4.09	4.33	4.22	4.32	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	10	17	4.52	325/1406	4.52	4.38	4.09	4.11	4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	1	7	16	4.52	334/1384	4.52	4.31	4.11	4.23	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	20	4.53	422/1489	4.53	4.34	4.17	4.18	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	29	4.90	583/1506	4.90	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	12	13	4.41	467/1463	4.41	4.33	4.09	4.18	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	5	21	4.70	531/1438	4.70	4.68	4.46	4.50	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	215/1421	4.97	4.91	4.73	4.76	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	4	21	4.64	442/1411	4.64	4.57	4.31	4.35	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	4	23	4.75	345/1405	4.75	4.55	4.32	4.34	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	3	2	13	10	4.07	630/1236	4.07	4.17	4.00	4.03	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	1	2	3	12	4.10	712/1260	4.10	4.20	4.14	4.25	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	681/1255	4.38	4.36	4.33	4.46	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	680/1258	4.45	4.51	4.38	4.51	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	10	13	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	****/ 873	****	3.87	4.03	4.26	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.65	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.73	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.69	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.00	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.19	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.33	****

Course-Section: HIST 479 1  
 Title China, 1912 To 1949  
 Instructor: Yip,Ka-che  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 893  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	6	Under-grad	30	Non-major	12
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HIST 483 1  
 Title Germ Hist: 1789 To 191  
 Instructor: Boehling,Rebecc (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 894  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	193/1509	4.86	4.53	4.31	4.39	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	356/1509	4.67	4.38	4.26	4.26	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	64/1287	4.95	4.49	4.30	4.38	4.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	258/1459	4.68	4.33	4.22	4.32	4.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	90/1406	4.90	4.38	4.09	4.11	4.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	421/1384	4.43	4.31	4.11	4.23	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	151/1489	4.81	4.34	4.17	4.18	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	583/1506	4.90	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	5	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1463	4.74	4.33	4.09	4.18	4.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	363/1438	4.88	4.68	4.46	4.50	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	4.98	4.91	4.73	4.76	4.98
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	190/1411	4.90	4.57	4.31	4.35	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.55	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1236	4.60	4.17	4.00	4.03	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	209/1260	4.80	4.20	4.14	4.25	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	0	17	4.65	453/1255	4.65	4.36	4.33	4.46	4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	299/1258	4.85	4.51	4.38	4.51	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	2	14	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	3.87	4.03	4.26	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 12	Graduate	1
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	21
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	6
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

Course-Section: HIST 483 1  
 Title Germ Hist: 1789 To 191  
 Instructor: Spinney, Russell (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 895  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	193/1509	4.86	4.53	4.31	4.39	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	356/1509	4.67	4.38	4.26	4.26	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	64/1287	4.95	4.49	4.30	4.38	4.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	258/1459	4.68	4.33	4.22	4.32	4.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	90/1406	4.90	4.38	4.09	4.11	4.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	421/1384	4.43	4.31	4.11	4.23	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	151/1489	4.81	4.34	4.17	4.18	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	583/1506	4.90	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	164/1463	4.74	4.33	4.09	4.18	4.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	110/1438	4.88	4.68	4.46	4.50	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	269/1421	4.98	4.91	4.73	4.76	4.98
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	69/1411	4.90	4.57	4.31	4.35	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.55	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	211/1236	4.60	4.17	4.00	4.03	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	209/1260	4.80	4.20	4.14	4.25	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	0	17	4.65	453/1255	4.65	4.36	4.33	4.46	4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	299/1258	4.85	4.51	4.38	4.51	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	2	14	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	3.87	4.03	4.26	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 12	Graduate	1
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	21
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	6
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

Course-Section: HIST 486 1  
 Title Soviet History On Tria  
 Instructor: Spinney,Russell  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 896  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	235/1509	4.82	4.53	4.31	4.39	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	333/1509	4.68	4.38	4.26	4.26	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	199/1287	4.82	4.49	4.30	4.38	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	6	13	4.43	586/1459	4.43	4.33	4.22	4.32	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	19	4.77	152/1406	4.77	4.38	4.09	4.11	4.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	3	13	4.32	557/1384	4.32	4.31	4.11	4.23	4.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	3	15	4.50	458/1489	4.50	4.34	4.17	4.18	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	782/1506	4.81	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	410/1463	4.44	4.33	4.09	4.18	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.68	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	665/1421	4.85	4.91	4.73	4.76	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	243/1411	4.80	4.57	4.31	4.35	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	228/1405	4.85	4.55	4.32	4.34	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	5	2	11	4.21	520/1236	4.21	4.17	4.00	4.03	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	2	13	4.44	469/1260	4.44	4.20	4.14	4.25	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	1	15	4.67	443/1255	4.67	4.36	4.33	4.46	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	398/1258	4.78	4.51	4.38	4.51	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	4	10	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	333/ 873	4.25	3.87	4.03	4.26	4.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.65	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.73	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.69	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 93	****	4.00	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.19	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.33	****

Course-Section: HIST 486 1  
 Title Soviet History On Tria  
 Instructor: Spinney, Russell  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 896  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	1	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	11
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HIST 493 1  
 Title Seminar In European Hi  
 Instructor: Froide, Amy M.  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 897  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	127/1509	4.92	4.53	4.31	4.39	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	245/1509	4.77	4.38	4.26	4.26	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	183/1287	4.83	4.49	4.30	4.38	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	126/1459	4.85	4.33	4.22	4.32	4.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	117/1406	4.85	4.38	4.09	4.11	4.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	92/1384	4.85	4.31	4.11	4.23	4.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	183/1489	4.77	4.34	4.17	4.18	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	137/1463	4.78	4.33	4.09	4.18	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	219/1438	4.91	4.68	4.46	4.50	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.91	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	138/1411	4.91	4.57	4.31	4.35	4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	172/1405	4.91	4.55	4.32	4.34	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1236	****	4.17	4.00	4.03	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.20	4.14	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	205/1255	4.90	4.36	4.33	4.46	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.51	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	169/ 873	4.63	3.87	4.03	4.26	4.63
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	28/ 89	4.92	4.65	4.49	4.71	4.92
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	22/ 92	4.92	4.73	4.54	4.83	4.92
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	50/ 90	4.58	4.69	4.50	4.69	4.58
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	17/ 92	4.83	4.63	4.38	4.64	4.83
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	17/ 93	4.83	4.00	4.06	4.32	4.83

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 495 1  
 Title Seminar In Amer Histor  
 Instructor: Meringolo,Denis  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 898  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	505/1509	4.69	4.53	4.31	4.39	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	311/1509	4.48	4.38	4.26	4.26	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	359/1287	4.47	4.49	4.30	4.38	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	302/1459	4.65	4.33	4.22	4.32	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	126/1406	4.74	4.38	4.09	4.11	4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	191/1384	4.67	4.31	4.11	4.23	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	364/1489	4.50	4.34	4.17	4.18	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	350/1506	4.94	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	241/1463	4.71	4.33	4.09	4.18	4.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	430/1438	4.83	4.68	4.46	4.50	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	483/1421	4.93	4.91	4.73	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	291/1411	4.78	4.57	4.31	4.35	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	683/1405	4.74	4.55	4.32	4.34	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	421/1236	4.56	4.17	4.00	4.03	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	258/1260	4.73	4.20	4.14	4.25	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	287/1255	4.80	4.36	4.33	4.46	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1258	4.88	4.51	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	255/ 873	4.41	3.87	4.03	4.26	4.42
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	31/ 89	4.83	4.65	4.49	4.71	4.91
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	25/ 92	4.86	4.73	4.54	4.83	4.91
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	26/ 90	4.86	4.69	4.50	4.69	4.91
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	29/ 92	4.78	4.63	4.38	4.64	4.73
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	27/ 93	4.40	4.00	4.06	4.32	4.64
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.19	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.07	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Under-grad 13
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Non-major 4
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 5
					Other 0

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

Course-Section: HIST 495 2  
 Title Seminar In Amer Histor  
 Instructor: Bouton,Robert T  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 899  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1509	4.69	4.53	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	175/1509	4.48	4.38	4.26	4.26	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	4.47	4.49	4.30	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	280/1459	4.65	4.33	4.22	4.32	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1406	4.74	4.38	4.09	4.11	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	96/1384	4.67	4.31	4.11	4.23	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	133/1489	4.50	4.34	4.17	4.18	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	782/1506	4.94	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1463	4.71	4.33	4.09	4.18	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1438	4.83	4.68	4.46	4.50	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	4.93	4.91	4.73	4.76	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1411	4.78	4.57	4.31	4.35	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1405	4.74	4.55	4.32	4.34	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1236	4.56	4.17	4.00	4.03	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1260	4.73	4.20	4.14	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1255	4.80	4.36	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1258	4.88	4.51	4.38	4.51	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 89	4.83	4.65	4.49	4.71	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	32/ 92	4.86	4.73	4.54	4.83	4.83
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	30/ 90	4.86	4.69	4.50	4.69	4.83
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	36/ 92	4.78	4.63	4.38	4.64	4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	24/ 93	4.40	4.00	4.06	4.32	4.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 495 3  
 Title Seminar In Amer Histor  
 Instructor: Nolan,Andrew Sh  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 900  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	176/1509	4.69	4.53	4.31	4.39	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	133/1509	4.48	4.38	4.26	4.26	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	143/1287	4.47	4.49	4.30	4.38	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	58/1459	4.65	4.33	4.22	4.32	4.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	99/1406	4.74	4.38	4.09	4.11	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	243/1384	4.67	4.31	4.11	4.23	4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	103/1489	4.50	4.34	4.17	4.18	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	350/1506	4.94	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	235/1463	4.71	4.33	4.09	4.18	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1438	4.83	4.68	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1421	4.93	4.91	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1411	4.78	4.57	4.31	4.35	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	103/1405	4.74	4.55	4.32	4.34	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	1	0	3	10	4.13	598/1236	4.56	4.17	4.00	4.03	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1260	4.73	4.20	4.14	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	143/1255	4.80	4.36	4.33	4.46	4.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	165/1258	4.88	4.51	4.38	4.51	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	2	1	4	4	3.91	536/ 873	4.41	3.87	4.03	4.26	3.91
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.67	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	0

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

Course-Section: HIST 495 4  
 Title Seminar In Amer Histor  
 Instructor: Lanman, Barry A. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 901  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	598/1509	4.69	4.53	4.31	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	1086/1509	4.48	4.38	4.26	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	844/1287	4.47	4.49	4.30	4.38	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	0	9	4.50	454/1459	4.65	4.33	4.22	4.32	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	332/1406	4.74	4.38	4.09	4.11	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	292/1384	4.67	4.31	4.11	4.23	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	923/1489	4.50	4.34	4.17	4.18	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1506	4.94	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	228/1463	4.71	4.33	4.09	4.18	4.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	413/1438	4.83	4.68	4.46	4.50	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	537/1421	4.93	4.91	4.73	4.76	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	416/1411	4.78	4.57	4.31	4.35	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	321/1405	4.74	4.55	4.32	4.34	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	73/1236	4.56	4.17	4.00	4.03	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	460/1260	4.73	4.20	4.14	4.25	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	474/1255	4.80	4.36	4.33	4.46	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	456/1258	4.88	4.51	4.38	4.51	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	152/ 873	4.41	3.87	4.03	4.26	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	47/ 89	4.83	4.65	4.49	4.71	4.71
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	30/ 92	4.86	4.73	4.54	4.83	4.86
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	29/ 90	4.86	4.69	4.50	4.69	4.86
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	16/ 92	4.78	4.63	4.38	4.64	4.86
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	51/ 93	4.40	4.00	4.06	4.32	4.14

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 495 4  
 Title Seminar In Amer Histor  
 Instructor: Willard,John D (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 902  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	598/1509	4.69	4.53	4.31	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	1086/1509	4.48	4.38	4.26	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	844/1287	4.47	4.49	4.30	4.38	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	0	9	4.50	454/1459	4.65	4.33	4.22	4.32	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	332/1406	4.74	4.38	4.09	4.11	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	292/1384	4.67	4.31	4.11	4.23	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	923/1489	4.50	4.34	4.17	4.18	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1506	4.94	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	209/1463	4.71	4.33	4.09	4.18	4.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	413/1438	4.83	4.68	4.46	4.50	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	537/1421	4.93	4.91	4.73	4.76	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	416/1411	4.78	4.57	4.31	4.35	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	321/1405	4.74	4.55	4.32	4.34	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	76/1236	4.56	4.17	4.00	4.03	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	460/1260	4.73	4.20	4.14	4.25	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	474/1255	4.80	4.36	4.33	4.46	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	456/1258	4.88	4.51	4.38	4.51	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	152/ 873	4.41	3.87	4.03	4.26	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	47/ 89	4.83	4.65	4.49	4.71	4.71
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	30/ 92	4.86	4.73	4.54	4.83	4.86
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	29/ 90	4.86	4.69	4.50	4.69	4.86
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	16/ 92	4.78	4.63	4.38	4.64	4.86
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	51/ 93	4.40	4.00	4.06	4.32	4.14

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 496 1  
 Title Historical Research  
 Instructor: Scott,Michelle  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 903  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	434/1509	4.65	4.53	4.31	4.39	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	378/1509	4.65	4.38	4.26	4.26	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.49	4.30	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	4	11	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.33	4.22	4.32	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	7	5	3.94	885/1406	3.94	4.38	4.09	4.11	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	81/1384	4.88	4.31	4.11	4.23	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	183/1489	4.76	4.34	4.17	4.18	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	1258/1506	4.25	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	309/1463	4.53	4.33	4.09	4.18	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	675/1438	4.60	4.68	4.46	4.50	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	794/1421	4.80	4.91	4.73	4.76	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	243/1411	4.80	4.57	4.31	4.35	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	683/1405	4.47	4.55	4.32	4.34	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	5	2	5	3.85	804/1236	3.85	4.17	4.00	4.03	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	1	5	5	3.92	844/1260	3.92	4.20	4.14	4.25	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	494/1255	4.62	4.36	4.33	4.46	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	312/1258	4.85	4.51	4.38	4.51	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	261/ 873	4.40	3.87	4.03	4.26	4.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.65	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.73	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.69	4.50	4.69	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 17	Graduate 0	Major 15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 17	Non-major 2
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	9	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	291/1509	4.76	4.53	4.31	4.39	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	289/1509	4.72	4.38	4.26	4.26	4.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1287	****	4.49	4.30	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	6	11	4.44	553/1459	4.44	4.33	4.22	4.32	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	1	1	0	4	3.71	1074/1406	3.71	4.38	4.09	4.11	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	165/1384	4.73	4.31	4.11	4.23	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	133/1489	4.83	4.34	4.17	4.18	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	408/1506	4.94	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.33	4.09	4.18	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	588/1438	4.67	4.68	4.46	4.50	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	639/1421	4.87	4.91	4.73	4.76	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	327/1411	4.73	4.57	4.31	4.35	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.55	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1236	****	4.17	4.00	4.03	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	469/1260	4.44	4.20	4.14	4.25	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.36	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.51	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.87	4.03	4.26	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.19	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0	Major 17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 18	Non-major 1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 1	Other 1		
				? 1			

Course-Section: HIST 701 1  
 Title Study Of History  
 Instructor: Kars,Marjoleine  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 905  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	686/1509	4.44	4.53	4.31	4.39	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	2	3	7	3.69	1298/1509	3.69	4.38	4.26	4.25	3.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1091/1287	3.75	4.49	4.30	4.22	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	4	7	3.81	1159/1459	3.81	4.33	4.22	4.16	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	377/1406	4.47	4.38	4.09	4.12	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	4	7	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.31	4.11	4.16	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	3	2	4	2	3	3.00	1403/1489	3.00	4.34	4.17	4.14	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	870/1506	4.73	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	1	7	2	3.91	983/1463	3.91	4.33	4.09	4.15	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	878/1438	4.44	4.68	4.46	4.49	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	483/1421	4.92	4.91	4.73	4.78	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	1005/1411	4.09	4.57	4.31	4.33	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	2	1	5	3.90	1132/1405	3.90	4.55	4.32	4.33	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	3	0	0	1	0	1.75	1228/1236	1.75	4.17	4.00	3.98	1.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	574/1260	4.31	4.20	4.14	4.21	4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	533/1255	4.56	4.36	4.33	4.43	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	850/1258	4.20	4.51	4.38	4.50	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	650/ 873	3.67	3.87	4.03	4.01	3.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	35/ 89	4.83	4.65	4.49	4.39	4.83
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	32/ 92	4.83	4.73	4.54	4.52	4.83
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	65/ 90	4.17	4.69	4.50	4.48	4.17
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	47/ 92	4.50	4.63	4.38	4.30	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	87/ 93	2.67	4.00	4.06	4.04	2.67
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.16	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 713 1  
 Title Seminar In Social Hist  
 Instructor: Lindenmeyer, Kri  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 906  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.53	4.31	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	859/1509	4.25	4.38	4.26	4.25	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	686/1459	4.33	4.33	4.22	4.16	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1045/1406	3.75	4.38	4.09	4.12	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	531/1384	4.33	4.31	4.11	4.16	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1403/1489	3.00	4.34	4.17	4.14	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	545/1463	4.33	4.33	4.09	4.15	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1001/1438	4.33	4.68	4.46	4.49	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.91	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	810/1411	4.33	4.57	4.31	4.33	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1047/1405	4.00	4.55	4.32	4.33	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	904/1236	3.67	4.17	4.00	3.98	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	746/1260	4.00	4.20	4.14	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	904/1255	4.00	4.36	4.33	4.43	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	770/1258	4.33	4.51	4.38	4.50	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	705/ 873	3.50	3.87	4.03	4.01	3.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	77/ 89	3.67	4.65	4.49	4.39	3.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	48/ 92	4.67	4.73	4.54	4.52	4.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	41/ 90	4.67	4.69	4.50	4.48	4.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	67/ 92	4.00	4.63	4.38	4.30	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	69/ 93	3.67	4.00	4.06	4.04	3.67

Frequency Distribution

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