

Course-Section: HIST 101 0101
 Title AMERICAN HISTORY TO 18
 Instructor: LINDENMEYER, KR
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 930
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	7	16	16	4.07	1106/1576	4.07	4.58	4.30	4.11	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	15	19	4.21	978/1576	4.21	4.49	4.27	4.18	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	14	26	4.57	510/1342	4.57	4.61	4.32	4.19	4.57		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	3	6	10	15	4.09	1003/1520	4.09	4.49	4.25	4.09	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	6	13	8	12	3.48	1257/1465	3.48	4.54	4.12	4.02	3.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	1	1	9	12	7	3.77	1087/1434	3.77	4.48	4.14	3.94	3.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	6	13	22	4.33	755/1547	4.33	4.53	4.19	4.10	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	20	22	4.52	1063/1574	4.52	4.69	4.64	4.59	4.52	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	15	19	4.37	584/1554	4.37	4.47	4.10	4.01	4.37	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	12	28	4.66	680/1488	4.66	4.76	4.47	4.41	4.66	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	35	4.85	683/1493	4.85	4.93	4.73	4.65	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	9	27	4.57	596/1486	4.57	4.68	4.32	4.26	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	12	26	4.54	660/1489	4.54	4.70	4.32	4.22	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	4	12	23	4.37	438/1277	4.37	4.26	4.03	3.91	4.37	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	2	5	9	12	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.37	4.17	3.96	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	2	3	9	16	4.30	805/1270	4.30	4.53	4.35	4.09	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	2	11	16	4.37	754/1269	4.37	4.61	4.35	4.09	4.37	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	23	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	****/ 878	****	3.99	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	4.19	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A 19	Required for Majors 23	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 16					
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C 1	General	5	Under-grad	42	Non-major 42
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	9	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 1					
				I 0	Other	9			
				? 1					

Course-Section: HIST 102 0101
 Title AMER HIST SINCE 1877
 Instructor: SMEAD, HOWARD
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 931
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	18	4.63	471/1576	4.63	4.58	4.30	4.11	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	16	4.52	594/1576	4.52	4.49	4.27	4.18	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	19	4.73	321/1342	4.73	4.61	4.32	4.19	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	197/1520	4.80	4.49	4.25	4.09	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	1	6	15	4.23	668/1465	4.23	4.54	4.12	4.02	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	226/1434	4.71	4.48	4.14	3.94	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	259/1547	4.73	4.53	4.19	4.10	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	20	6	4.23	1339/1574	4.23	4.69	4.64	4.59	4.23	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	13	11	4.40	532/1554	4.40	4.47	4.10	4.01	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	385/1488	4.81	4.76	4.47	4.41	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	445/1493	4.93	4.93	4.73	4.65	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	311/1486	4.78	4.68	4.32	4.26	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	251/1489	4.85	4.70	4.32	4.22	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	12	12	4.38	421/1277	4.38	4.26	4.03	3.91	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	758/1279	4.13	4.37	4.17	3.96	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	860/1270	4.19	4.53	4.35	4.09	4.19	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.61	4.35	4.09	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	12	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 878	****	3.99	4.05	3.91	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 27 Non-major 26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 7	
			? 2		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	6	25	4.60	500/1576	4.60	4.58	4.30	4.11	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	12	20	4.46	683/1576	4.46	4.49	4.27	4.18	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	24	4.63	455/1342	4.63	4.61	4.32	4.19	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	12	19	4.52	499/1520	4.52	4.49	4.25	4.09	4.52	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	28	4.71	231/1465	4.71	4.54	4.12	4.02	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	9	21	4.46	461/1434	4.46	4.48	4.14	3.94	4.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	5	13	14	4.15	939/1547	4.15	4.53	4.19	4.10	4.15	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	25	4.74	795/1574	4.74	4.69	4.64	4.59	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	1	11	16	4.41	518/1554	4.41	4.47	4.10	4.01	4.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	26	4.76	505/1488	4.76	4.76	4.47	4.41	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	30	4.85	683/1493	4.85	4.93	4.73	4.65	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	9	23	4.62	545/1486	4.62	4.68	4.32	4.26	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	6	25	4.65	526/1489	4.65	4.70	4.32	4.22	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	3	5	26	4.68	208/1277	4.68	4.26	4.03	3.91	4.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	11	11	4.32	610/1279	4.32	4.37	4.17	3.96	4.32	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	3	9	14	4.42	716/1270	4.42	4.53	4.35	4.09	4.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	8	16	4.54	626/1269	4.54	4.61	4.35	4.09	4.54	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	2	1	5	6	8	3.77	620/ 878	3.77	3.99	4.05	3.91	3.77	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0	Major 6
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 13			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 3	General 5	Under-grad 35	Non-major 29
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 1			
				I 0	Other 12		
				? 0			

Course-Section: HIST 110 0101
 Title WESTERN CIV TO 1700
 Instructor: MCDONOUGH, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 933
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	5	9	12	3.90	1241/1576	4.34	4.58	4.30	4.11	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	9	7	11	3.93	1207/1576	4.31	4.49	4.27	4.18	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	8	11	11	11	4.10	938/1342	4.47	4.61	4.32	4.19	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	8	9	8	3.79	1241/1520	4.16	4.49	4.25	4.09	3.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	5	16	4.13	768/1465	4.20	4.54	4.12	4.02	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	6	13	7	3.73	1105/1434	4.05	4.48	4.14	3.94	3.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	9	14	4.17	924/1547	4.39	4.53	4.19	4.10	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	188/1574	4.98	4.69	4.64	4.59	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	7	10	7	3.81	1132/1554	4.09	4.47	4.10	4.01	3.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	10	18	4.53	834/1488	4.71	4.76	4.47	4.41	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	27	4.87	658/1493	4.90	4.93	4.73	4.65	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	4	10	15	4.27	951/1486	4.52	4.68	4.32	4.26	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	10	15	4.23	969/1489	4.53	4.70	4.32	4.22	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	3	5	7	12	4.04	680/1277	4.21	4.26	4.03	3.91	4.04	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	3	5	4	9	3.90	899/1279	4.05	4.37	4.17	3.96	3.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	5	5	10	4.14	881/1270	4.32	4.53	4.35	4.09	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	3	1	6	11	4.19	852/1269	4.41	4.61	4.35	4.09	4.19	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	0	5	6	5	4.00	464/ 878	3.43	3.99	4.05	3.91	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	3	Under-grad	30	Non-major	27
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HIST 110 0201
 Title WESTERN CIV TO 1700
 Instructor: BIRKENMEIER, JO
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 934
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	266/1576	4.34	4.58	4.30	4.11	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	364/1576	4.31	4.49	4.27	4.18	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	215/1342	4.47	4.61	4.32	4.19	4.84		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	487/1520	4.16	4.49	4.25	4.09	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	637/1465	4.20	4.54	4.12	4.02	4.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	564/1434	4.05	4.48	4.14	3.94	4.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	399/1547	4.39	4.53	4.19	4.10	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1574	4.98	4.69	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	571/1554	4.09	4.47	4.10	4.01	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	278/1488	4.71	4.76	4.47	4.41	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	334/1493	4.90	4.93	4.73	4.65	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	311/1486	4.52	4.68	4.32	4.26	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	274/1489	4.53	4.70	4.32	4.22	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	421/1277	4.21	4.26	4.03	3.91	4.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	719/1279	4.05	4.37	4.17	3.96	4.19	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	636/1270	4.32	4.53	4.35	4.09	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	567/1269	4.41	4.61	4.35	4.09	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	9	1	1	4	0	1	2.86	831/ 878	3.43	3.99	4.05	3.91	2.86	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.81	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.73	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.55	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.64	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.19	4.01	3.78	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 111 0101
 Title WESTERN CIV SINCE 1700
 Instructor: LAURIE, CLAYTON
 Enrollment: 55
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 935
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	2	13	18	4.34	850/1576	4.34	4.58	4.30	4.11	4.34	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	9	22	4.46	683/1576	4.46	4.49	4.27	4.18	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	10	18	4.26	835/1342	4.26	4.61	4.32	4.19	4.26	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	0	8	10	13	4.06	1012/1520	4.06	4.49	4.25	4.09	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	5	10	18	4.20	708/1465	4.20	4.54	4.12	4.02	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	6	19	8	3.91	991/1434	3.91	4.48	4.14	3.94	3.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	6	26	4.63	387/1547	4.63	4.53	4.19	4.10	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	9	25	4.69	881/1574	4.69	4.69	4.64	4.59	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	1	14	11	4.38	558/1554	4.38	4.47	4.10	4.01	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	29	4.82	370/1488	4.82	4.76	4.47	4.41	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	167/1493	4.97	4.93	4.73	4.65	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	8	23	4.56	619/1486	4.56	4.68	4.32	4.26	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	3	9	20	4.32	899/1489	4.32	4.70	4.32	4.22	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	2	4	13	13	4.06	668/1277	4.06	4.26	4.03	3.91	4.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	4	0	5	6	5	3.40	1106/1279	3.40	4.37	4.17	3.96	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	1	7	5	5	3.50	1135/1270	3.50	4.53	4.35	4.09	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	3	1	4	3	9	3.70	1055/1269	3.70	4.61	4.35	4.09	3.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	15	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 878	****	3.99	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.81	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 79	****	4.73	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.55	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.64	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.19	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: HIST 111 0101
 Title WESTERN CIV SINCE 1700
 Instructor: LAURIE, CLAYTON
 Enrollment: 55
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 935
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	4	Under-grad	36	Non-major	33
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 200 0101
 Title THEMES IN WORLD HISTOR
 Instructor: FROIDE, AMY
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 936
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	8	17	4.56	568/1576	4.58	4.58	4.30	4.35	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	290/1576	4.62	4.49	4.27	4.32	4.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	22	4.77	286/1342	4.32	4.61	4.32	4.41	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	6	19	4.76	239/1520	4.66	4.49	4.25	4.26	4.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	6	17	4.44	454/1465	4.50	4.54	4.12	4.09	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	8	17	4.62	314/1434	4.38	4.48	4.14	4.06	4.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	186/1547	4.60	4.53	4.19	4.22	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	13	4.48	1103/1574	4.49	4.69	4.64	4.62	4.48	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	9	14	4.61	316/1554	4.44	4.47	4.10	4.05	4.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	324/1488	4.75	4.76	4.47	4.44	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	445/1493	4.94	4.93	4.73	4.75	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	261/1486	4.73	4.68	4.32	4.29	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	25	4.85	251/1489	4.73	4.70	4.32	4.31	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	5	7	15	4.37	429/1277	4.53	4.26	4.03	4.01	4.37	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	3	15	4.48	477/1279	4.46	4.37	4.17	4.14	4.48	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	4	15	4.65	514/1270	4.67	4.53	4.35	4.30	4.65	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	332/1269	4.68	4.61	4.35	4.29	4.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	410/ 878	3.29	3.99	4.05	3.92	4.18	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.44	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.81	4.72	4.78	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.73	4.69	4.72	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.55	4.64	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.64	4.61	4.80	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 375	****	4.19	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.74	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.71	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.69	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.64	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.39	****	

Course-Section: HIST 200 0101
 Title THEMES IN WORLD HISTOR
 Instructor: FROIDE, AMY
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 936
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	6	Under-grad	27	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HIST 200 0201
 Title THEMES IN WORLD HISTOR
 Instructor: BROWN, KATHRYN
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 937
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	500/1576	4.58	4.58	4.30	4.35	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	608/1576	4.62	4.49	4.27	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1080/1342	4.32	4.61	4.32	4.41	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	453/1520	4.66	4.49	4.25	4.26	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	335/1465	4.50	4.54	4.12	4.09	4.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	5	10	4.15	787/1434	4.38	4.48	4.14	4.06	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	690/1547	4.60	4.53	4.19	4.22	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	1079/1574	4.49	4.69	4.64	4.62	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	8	8	4.28	692/1554	4.44	4.47	4.10	4.05	4.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	680/1488	4.75	4.76	4.47	4.44	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	334/1493	4.94	4.93	4.73	4.75	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	484/1486	4.73	4.68	4.32	4.29	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	579/1489	4.73	4.70	4.32	4.31	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	201/1277	4.53	4.26	4.03	4.01	4.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	6	9	4.44	521/1279	4.46	4.37	4.17	4.14	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	0	1	14	4.69	487/1270	4.67	4.53	4.35	4.30	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	644/1269	4.68	4.61	4.35	4.29	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	10	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	853/ 878	3.29	3.99	4.05	3.92	2.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.81	4.72	4.78	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.73	4.69	4.72	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.64	4.61	4.80	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.19	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.74	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.71	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.69	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 201 0101
 Title INTRO TO STUDY OF HIST
 Instructor: RITSCHHEL, DANIE
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 938
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	13	9	10	3.69	1374/1576	3.69	4.58	4.30	4.35	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	7	10	12	3.77	1303/1576	3.77	4.49	4.27	4.32	3.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	26	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	857/1342	4.22	4.61	4.32	4.41	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	5	15	12	4.12	977/1520	4.12	4.49	4.25	4.26	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	7	11	14	4.03	839/1465	4.03	4.54	4.12	4.09	4.03	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	5	11	17	4.26	670/1434	4.26	4.48	4.14	4.06	4.26	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	4	3	10	14	3.82	1204/1547	3.82	4.53	4.19	4.22	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	31	4.94	328/1574	4.94	4.69	4.64	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	0	2	9	14	1	3.54	1292/1554	3.54	4.47	4.10	4.05	3.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	6	8	21	4.43	970/1488	4.43	4.76	4.47	4.44	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	10	23	4.60	1125/1493	4.60	4.93	4.73	4.75	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	8	12	12	3.94	1158/1486	3.94	4.68	4.32	4.29	3.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	6	12	11	3.74	1258/1489	3.74	4.70	4.32	4.31	3.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	25	3	1	1	4	0	2.67	1219/1277	2.67	4.26	4.03	4.01	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	8	7	11	3.96	840/1279	3.96	4.37	4.17	4.14	3.96	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	0	4	9	13	4.11	903/1270	4.11	4.53	4.35	4.30	4.11	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	4	8	15	4.32	780/1269	4.32	4.61	4.35	4.29	4.32	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	20	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	****/ 878	****	3.99	4.05	3.92	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.81	4.72	4.78	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 1	B 13		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 3	C 6	General	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		Under-grad 35
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	25
			? 1		

Course-Section: HIST 274 0101
 Title CONTEMPORARY JEWISH HI
 Instructor: KATZ, DAVID
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 939
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	500/1576	4.61	4.58	4.30	4.35	4.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	15	4.48	653/1576	4.48	4.49	4.27	4.32	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	1	3	15	4.55	531/1342	4.55	4.61	4.32	4.41	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.49	4.25	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	193/1465	4.77	4.54	4.12	4.09	4.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	184/1434	4.77	4.48	4.14	4.06	4.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	6	5	10	4.19	900/1547	4.19	4.53	4.19	4.22	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	6	5	11	4.23	1346/1574	4.23	4.69	4.64	4.62	4.23	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	10	9	4.47	436/1554	4.47	4.47	4.10	4.05	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	309/1488	4.86	4.76	4.47	4.44	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	557/1493	4.91	4.93	4.73	4.75	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	393/1486	4.71	4.68	4.32	4.29	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	420/1489	4.73	4.70	4.32	4.31	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	13	1	1	1	0	4	3.71	916/1277	3.71	4.26	4.03	4.01	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	2	2	10	4.13	758/1279	4.13	4.37	4.17	4.14	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	0	2	5	6	3.87	1016/1270	3.87	4.53	4.35	4.30	3.87	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	2	1	10	4.20	852/1269	4.20	4.61	4.35	4.29	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	10	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 878	****	3.99	4.05	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 8	Under-grad 23 Non-major 22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 5	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	16	60	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.58	4.30	4.30	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	15	63	4.74	290/1576	4.74	4.49	4.27	4.28	4.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	17	64	4.79	251/1342	4.79	4.61	4.32	4.30	4.79		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	4	20	52	4.60	406/1520	4.60	4.49	4.25	4.25	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	7	21	45	4.26	637/1465	4.26	4.54	4.12	4.09	4.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	15	21	42	4.29	647/1434	4.29	4.48	4.14	4.15	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	12	65	4.76	228/1547	4.76	4.53	4.19	4.21	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	48	31	4.39	1210/1574	4.39	4.69	4.64	4.61	4.39	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	2	0	0	0	16	48	4.75	194/1554	4.75	4.47	4.10	4.09	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	10	69	4.87	293/1488	4.87	4.76	4.47	4.47	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	77	4.97	167/1493	4.97	4.93	4.73	4.70	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	10	68	4.85	231/1486	4.85	4.68	4.32	4.32	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	11	66	4.83	274/1489	4.83	4.70	4.32	4.34	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	2	8	12	54	4.46	347/1277	4.46	4.26	4.03	4.11	4.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	45	0	10	4	10	2	10	2.94	1204/1279	2.94	4.37	4.17	4.20	2.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	45	0	5	4	7	4	16	3.61	1111/1270	3.61	4.53	4.35	4.42	3.61	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	45	0	3	2	4	7	20	4.08	911/1269	4.08	4.61	4.35	4.41	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	45	29	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	****/ 878	****	3.99	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	80	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	80	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	80	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	80	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	80	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	80	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.81	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	80	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.73	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	80	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	4.55	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	80	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.64	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	80	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 375	****	4.19	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	80	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	80	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	80	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	80	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	80	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	80	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	80	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	80	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	80	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	80	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: HIST 303 0101
 Title SECOND WORLD WAR
 Instructor: LAURIE, CLAYTON
 Enrollment: 108
 Questionnaires: 81

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 940
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	53	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	16	2.00-2.99	14	C	0	General	31	Under-grad	81	Non-major	63
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	20	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	28				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 326 0101
 Title HIST/AMER WMN SINCE 18
 Instructor: SCOTT, MICHELLE
 Enrollment: 63
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 941
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	4	32	4.74	312/1576	4.74	4.58	4.30	4.30	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	30	4.72	324/1576	4.72	4.49	4.27	4.28	4.72	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	29	4.69	369/1342	4.69	4.61	4.32	4.30	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	7	27	4.65	357/1520	4.65	4.49	4.25	4.25	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	5	2	30	4.61	304/1465	4.61	4.54	4.12	4.09	4.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	8	26	4.55	360/1434	4.55	4.48	4.14	4.15	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	6	29	4.66	351/1547	4.66	4.53	4.19	4.21	4.66	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	22	15	4.41	1202/1574	4.41	4.69	4.64	4.61	4.41	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	0	0	1	9	21	4.65	281/1554	4.65	4.47	4.10	4.09	4.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	36	4.90	263/1488	4.90	4.76	4.47	4.47	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	38	4.95	334/1493	4.95	4.93	4.73	4.70	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	34	4.89	181/1486	4.89	4.68	4.32	4.32	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	35	4.85	263/1489	4.85	4.70	4.32	4.34	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	9	29	4.72	181/1277	4.72	4.26	4.03	4.11	4.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	11	21	4.51	438/1279	4.51	4.37	4.17	4.20	4.51	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	3	31	4.86	307/1270	4.86	4.53	4.35	4.42	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	32	4.89	299/1269	4.89	4.61	4.35	4.41	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	0	8	7	18	4.21	395/ 878	4.21	3.99	4.05	4.09	4.21	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0	Major 5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 16			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	7	C 3	General 12	Under-grad 40	Non-major 35
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 11		
				? 3			

Course-Section: HIST 358 0101
 Title ART & SOCTY: RENAISSAN
 Instructor: GRUBB, JAMES S
 Enrollment: 81
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 942
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	6	6	24	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.58	4.30	4.30	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	7	23	4.47	653/1576	4.47	4.49	4.27	4.28	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	1	8	23	4.61	480/1342	4.61	4.61	4.32	4.30	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	2	3	6	23	4.47	562/1520	4.47	4.49	4.25	4.25	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	2	9	21	4.28	626/1465	4.28	4.54	4.12	4.09	4.28	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	4	8	22	4.46	461/1434	4.46	4.48	4.14	4.15	4.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	6	6	23	4.42	673/1547	4.42	4.53	4.19	4.21	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	2	7	24	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.69	4.64	4.61	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	1	0	1	9	14	4.40	532/1554	4.40	4.47	4.10	4.09	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	6	27	4.66	680/1488	4.66	4.76	4.47	4.47	4.66	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	2	2	30	4.71	986/1493	4.71	4.93	4.73	4.70	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	6	27	4.71	393/1486	4.71	4.68	4.32	4.32	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	7	27	4.79	322/1489	4.79	4.70	4.32	4.34	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	0	1	4	26	4.69	201/1277	4.69	4.26	4.03	4.11	4.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	2	3	6	10	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.37	4.17	4.20	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	1	2	3	13	4.14	881/1270	4.14	4.53	4.35	4.42	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	575/1269	4.62	4.61	4.35	4.41	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	9	2	1	3	3	3	3.33	755/ 878	3.33	3.99	4.05	4.09	3.33	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	****	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 15		Graduate 0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 37
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 3		

Course-Section: HIST 371 8620
 Title HISTORY AND FILM
 Instructor: NOLAN, ANDREW
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 943
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	0	0	0	6	21	4.78	277/1576	4.78	4.58	4.30	4.30	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	406/1576	4.65	4.49	4.27	4.28	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	2	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	298/1342	4.75	4.61	4.32	4.30	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	2	1	0	1	5	18	4.56	441/1520	4.56	4.49	4.25	4.25	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	297/1465	4.62	4.54	4.12	4.09	4.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	4	5	17	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.48	4.14	4.15	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	2	0	6	18	4.54	492/1547	4.54	4.53	4.19	4.21	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	1	0	25	4.92	375/1574	4.92	4.69	4.64	4.61	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	180/1554	4.78	4.47	4.10	4.09	4.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.76	4.47	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.93	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	69/1486	4.96	4.68	4.32	4.32	4.96	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	217/1489	4.89	4.70	4.32	4.34	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	1	0	0	1	24	4.81	132/1277	4.81	4.26	4.03	4.11	4.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	1	3	17	4.64	358/1279	4.64	4.37	4.17	4.20	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	345/1270	4.82	4.53	4.35	4.42	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	278/1269	4.91	4.61	4.35	4.41	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	10	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	3.99	4.05	4.09	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 1 Major 7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General 9	Under-grad 32 Non-major 26
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 8	
			? 0		

Course-Section: HIST 383 0101
 Title JAPAN IN SHOGUN AGE
 Instructor: VAPORIS, CONSTA
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 944
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	10	12	4.27	940/1576	4.27	4.58	4.30	4.30	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	7	13	4.19	996/1576	4.19	4.49	4.27	4.28	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	15	4.46	633/1342	4.46	4.61	4.32	4.30	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	10	11	4.15	953/1520	4.15	4.49	4.25	4.25	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	7	13	4.19	708/1465	4.19	4.54	4.12	4.09	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	4	10	8	3.77	1087/1434	3.77	4.48	4.14	4.15	3.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	7	12	4.12	955/1547	4.12	4.53	4.19	4.21	4.12	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	14	11	4.35	1253/1574	4.35	4.69	4.64	4.61	4.35	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	11	10	4.35	610/1554	4.35	4.47	4.10	4.09	4.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	5	17	4.56	798/1488	4.56	4.76	4.47	4.47	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.93	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	1	11	10	4.08	1075/1486	4.08	4.68	4.32	4.32	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	6	16	4.48	719/1489	4.48	4.70	4.32	4.34	4.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	4	5	14	4.24	551/1277	4.24	4.26	4.03	4.11	4.24	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	764/1279	4.12	4.37	4.17	4.20	4.12	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	897/1270	4.12	4.53	4.35	4.42	4.12	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	864/1269	4.18	4.61	4.35	4.41	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	1	3	11	1	3.75	631/ 878	3.75	3.99	4.05	4.09	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 1	A 6	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 14
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 4	C 7	General 10	Under-grad 26 Non-major 12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 12	
			? 0		

Course-Section: HIST 403 0101
 Title THE AMERICAN COLONIES
 Instructor: KARS, MARJOLEIN
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 945
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	8	12	4.19	1019/1576	4.19	4.58	4.30	4.46	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	4	10	7	3.62	1364/1576	3.62	4.49	4.27	4.35	3.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	17	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	925/1342	4.13	4.61	4.32	4.46	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	2	6	7	8	3.91	1153/1520	3.91	4.49	4.25	4.38	3.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	304/1465	4.60	4.54	4.12	4.22	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	4	1	4	6	8	3.57	1184/1434	3.57	4.48	4.14	4.30	3.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	6	7	11	4.08	985/1547	4.08	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	375/1574	4.92	4.69	4.64	4.69	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	3	1	3	7	5	3.53	1295/1554	3.53	4.47	4.10	4.24	3.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	1	1	6	14	4.08	1209/1488	4.08	4.76	4.47	4.55	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	986/1493	4.72	4.93	4.73	4.80	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	1	3	6	11	3.88	1207/1486	3.88	4.68	4.32	4.41	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	8	11	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.70	4.32	4.38	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	2	7	6	7	3.58	983/1277	3.58	4.26	4.03	4.04	3.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	3	5	4	10	3.83	930/1279	3.83	4.37	4.17	4.31	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	6	14	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.53	4.35	4.53	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	1	8	11	4.23	835/1269	4.23	4.61	4.35	4.55	4.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	9	2	1	3	6	0	3.08	795/ 878	3.08	3.99	4.05	4.33	3.08	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 18
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 5	General 4	Under-grad 26 Non-major 8
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 4	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 16	
			? 3		

Course-Section: HIST 407 0101
 Title FOUNDING OF AMER NATIO
 Instructor: BOUTON, TERRY
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 946
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	211/1576	4.85	4.58	4.30	4.46	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	20	4.77	267/1576	4.77	4.49	4.27	4.35	4.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	240/1342	4.81	4.61	4.32	4.46	4.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	6	16	4.48	545/1520	4.48	4.49	4.25	4.38	4.48	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	7	14	4.35	562/1465	4.35	4.54	4.12	4.22	4.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	5	16	4.42	498/1434	4.42	4.48	4.14	4.30	4.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	303/1547	4.69	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	19	7	4.27	1317/1574	4.27	4.69	4.64	4.69	4.27	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	237/1554	4.70	4.47	4.10	4.24	4.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	198/1488	4.92	4.76	4.47	4.55	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	607/1493	4.88	4.93	4.73	4.80	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	23	4.88	191/1486	4.88	4.68	4.32	4.41	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	217/1489	4.88	4.70	4.32	4.38	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	309/1277	4.50	4.26	4.03	4.04	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	681/1279	4.24	4.37	4.17	4.31	4.24	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	620/1270	4.53	4.53	4.35	4.53	4.53	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	596/1269	4.59	4.61	4.35	4.55	4.59	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	13	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 878	****	3.99	4.05	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 12						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	3	Under-grad	26	Non-major	4
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	17				
			? 3						

Course-Section: HIST 421 0101
 Title THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR
 Instructor: RUBIN, ANNE
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 947
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	471/1576	4.63	4.58	4.30	4.46	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	9	13	4.46	683/1576	4.46	4.49	4.27	4.35	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	633/1342	4.47	4.61	4.32	4.46	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	3	0	8	12	4.26	848/1520	4.26	4.49	4.25	4.38	4.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	3	17	4.54	341/1465	4.54	4.54	4.12	4.22	4.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	5	14	4.25	682/1434	4.25	4.48	4.14	4.30	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	5	16	4.54	480/1547	4.54	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	15	8	4.29	1295/1574	4.29	4.69	4.64	4.69	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	463/1554	4.45	4.47	4.10	4.24	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	547/1488	4.74	4.76	4.47	4.55	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	784/1493	4.82	4.93	4.73	4.80	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	3	18	4.65	484/1486	4.65	4.68	4.32	4.41	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	336/1489	4.78	4.70	4.32	4.38	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	0	1	4	14	4.33	463/1277	4.33	4.26	4.03	4.04	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	554/1279	4.40	4.37	4.17	4.31	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	355/1270	4.80	4.53	4.35	4.53	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	467/1269	4.73	4.61	4.35	4.55	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	339/ 878	4.30	3.99	4.05	4.33	4.30	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.28	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.45	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.70	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.81	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.73	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	4.55	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.64	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	4.19	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.88	****	

Course-Section: HIST 421 0101
 Title THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR
 Instructor: RUBIN, ANNE
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 947
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	8	Under-grad	25	Non-major	9
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HIST 441 0101
 Title ORIG MOD AMER:1877-192
 Instructor: LINDENMEYER, KR
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 948
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	277/1576	4.83	4.58	4.30	4.46	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	91/1576	4.91	4.49	4.27	4.35	4.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	107/1342	4.91	4.61	4.32	4.46	4.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	339/1520	4.77	4.49	4.25	4.38	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	159/1465	4.77	4.54	4.12	4.22	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	118/1434	4.87	4.48	4.14	4.30	4.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	270/1547	4.79	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	281/1574	4.90	4.69	4.64	4.69	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	281/1554	4.82	4.47	4.10	4.24	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	149/1488	4.97	4.76	4.47	4.55	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.93	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	191/1486	4.94	4.68	4.32	4.41	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	217/1489	4.75	4.70	4.32	4.38	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	375/1277	4.66	4.26	4.03	4.04	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	296/1279	4.77	4.37	4.17	4.31	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	208/1270	4.88	4.53	4.35	4.53	4.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	332/1269	4.85	4.61	4.35	4.55	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	245/ 878	4.48	3.99	4.05	4.33	4.46	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.28	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.45	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.70	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.81	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.73	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.55	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.64	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.19	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.88	****	

Course-Section: HIST 441 0101
 Title ORIG MOD AMER:1877-192
 Instructor: LINDENMEYER, KR
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 948
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	18	Non-major	12
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 441 8620
 Title ORIG MOD AMER:1877-192
 Instructor: NOLAN, ANDREW
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 949
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	187/1576	4.83	4.58	4.30	4.46	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	173/1576	4.91	4.49	4.27	4.35	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	197/1342	4.91	4.61	4.32	4.46	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	155/1520	4.77	4.49	4.25	4.38	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	231/1465	4.77	4.54	4.12	4.22	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	130/1434	4.87	4.48	4.14	4.30	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	154/1547	4.79	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	567/1574	4.90	4.69	4.64	4.69	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1554	4.82	4.47	4.10	4.24	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1488	4.97	4.76	4.47	4.55	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.93	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1486	4.94	4.68	4.32	4.41	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	552/1489	4.75	4.70	4.32	4.38	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	113/1277	4.66	4.26	4.03	4.04	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	204/1279	4.77	4.37	4.17	4.31	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	326/1270	4.88	4.53	4.35	4.53	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	353/1269	4.85	4.61	4.35	4.55	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	221/ 878	4.48	3.99	4.05	4.33	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 0	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General	2 Under-grad 9 Non-major 5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: HIST 442 0101
 Title U.S.:1917 TO 1945
 Instructor: MERINGOLO, DENI
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 950
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	8	11	4.33	861/1576	4.33	4.58	4.30	4.46	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	811/1576	4.36	4.49	4.27	4.35	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1166/1342	3.67	4.61	4.32	4.46	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	1	10	8	4.05	1022/1520	4.05	4.49	4.25	4.38	4.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	5	12	4.29	616/1465	4.29	4.54	4.12	4.22	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	8	11	4.18	758/1434	4.18	4.48	4.14	4.30	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	8	12	4.36	727/1547	4.36	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	9	4.43	1177/1574	4.43	4.69	4.64	4.69	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	11	7	4.32	649/1554	4.32	4.47	4.10	4.24	4.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	589/1488	4.71	4.76	4.47	4.55	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	279/1493	4.95	4.93	4.73	4.80	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	720/1486	4.48	4.68	4.32	4.41	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	6	12	4.33	888/1489	4.33	4.70	4.32	4.38	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	4	4	9	4.17	608/1277	4.17	4.26	4.03	4.04	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	8	7	4.24	681/1279	4.24	4.37	4.17	4.31	4.24	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	523/1270	4.65	4.53	4.35	4.53	4.65	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.61	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	2	4	6	4	3.75	631/ 878	3.75	3.99	4.05	4.33	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 0	C 2	General 5	Under-grad 22 Non-major 11
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 13	
			? 1		

Course-Section: HIST 446 0101
 Title HIST OF SCI SINCE 1700
 Instructor: TATAREWICZ, JOS
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 951
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	266/1576	4.79	4.58	4.30	4.46	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.49	4.27	4.35	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	345/1342	4.71	4.61	4.32	4.46	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	665/1520	4.42	4.49	4.25	4.38	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	668/1465	4.23	4.54	4.12	4.22	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	448/1434	4.46	4.48	4.14	4.30	4.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	7	4	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.69	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	571/1554	4.38	4.47	4.10	4.24	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.76	4.47	4.55	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.93	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.68	4.32	4.41	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	274/1489	4.83	4.70	4.32	4.38	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	129/1277	4.82	4.26	4.03	4.04	4.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.37	4.17	4.31	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	827/1270	4.25	4.53	4.35	4.53	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	491/1269	4.71	4.61	4.35	4.55	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.99	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.45	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.73	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.55	4.64	4.64	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 447 0101
 Title HISTORY OF CIVIL RIGHT
 Instructor: SMEAD, HOWARD
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 952
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	195/1576	4.87	4.58	4.30	4.46	4.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	350/1576	4.70	4.49	4.27	4.35	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	263/1342	4.78	4.61	4.32	4.46	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	6	0	14	4.29	826/1520	4.29	4.49	4.25	4.38	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	4	14	4.35	562/1465	4.35	4.54	4.12	4.22	4.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	1	3	4	11	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.48	4.14	4.30	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	207/1547	4.78	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	20	2	4.09	1427/1574	4.09	4.69	4.64	4.69	4.09	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	289/1554	4.63	4.47	4.10	4.24	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	309/1488	4.86	4.76	4.47	4.55	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	279/1493	4.95	4.93	4.73	4.80	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	2	18	4.73	379/1486	4.73	4.68	4.32	4.41	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	194/1489	4.91	4.70	4.32	4.38	4.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	5	1	2	2	6	3.19	1123/1277	3.19	4.26	4.03	4.04	3.19	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	625/1279	4.31	4.37	4.17	4.31	4.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	4	2	6	3.92	990/1270	3.92	4.53	4.35	4.53	3.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	2	1	9	4.31	793/1269	4.31	4.61	4.35	4.55	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	8	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 878	****	3.99	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.28	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.45	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.70	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.81	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.73	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.55	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.64	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.19	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.88	****	

Course-Section: HIST 447 0101
 Title HISTORY OF CIVIL RIGHT
 Instructor: SMEAD, HOWARD
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 952
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	24	Non-major	11
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HIST 453 0101
 Title ANCIENT GREECE
 Instructor: STORCH, RUDOLPH
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 953
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	6	20	4.57	541/1576	4.57	4.58	4.30	4.46	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	0	8	18	4.46	668/1576	4.46	4.49	4.27	4.35	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	5	19	4.43	683/1342	4.43	4.61	4.32	4.46	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	441/1520	4.56	4.49	4.25	4.38	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	5	10	12	4.14	758/1465	4.14	4.54	4.12	4.22	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	1	0	4	5	5	3.87	1027/1434	3.87	4.48	4.14	4.30	3.87	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	0	4	22	4.57	445/1547	4.57	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	13	14	4.52	1071/1574	4.52	4.69	4.64	4.69	4.52	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	6	6	12	4.25	712/1554	4.25	4.47	4.10	4.24	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	3	20	4.65	680/1488	4.65	4.76	4.47	4.55	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	445/1493	4.92	4.93	4.73	4.80	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	6	17	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.68	4.32	4.41	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	1	23	4.77	364/1489	4.77	4.70	4.32	4.38	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	0	4	8	11	4.17	608/1277	4.17	4.26	4.03	4.04	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	0	2	2	4	3.60	1022/1279	3.60	4.37	4.17	4.31	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1006/1270	3.90	4.53	4.35	4.53	3.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	2	0	2	2	4	3.60	1086/1269	3.60	4.61	4.35	4.55	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	8	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 878	****	3.99	4.05	4.33	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 15	Required for Majors	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	4
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	19
			? 1		

Course-Section: HIST 456 8620
 Title THE ROMAN EMPIRE
 Instructor: BIRKENMEIER, JO
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 954
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	373/1576	4.70	4.58	4.30	4.46	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	476/1576	4.60	4.49	4.27	4.35	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.61	4.32	4.46	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.49	4.25	4.38	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.54	4.12	4.22	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.48	4.14	4.30	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	303/1547	4.70	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	469/1574	4.90	4.69	4.64	4.69	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.47	4.10	4.24	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	750/1488	4.60	4.76	4.47	4.55	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	810/1493	4.80	4.93	4.73	4.80	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	311/1486	4.78	4.68	4.32	4.41	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	813/1489	4.40	4.70	4.32	4.38	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	215/1277	4.67	4.26	4.03	4.04	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.37	4.17	4.31	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.53	4.35	4.53	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	747/1269	4.38	4.61	4.35	4.55	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	425/ 878	4.14	3.99	4.05	4.33	4.14	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 463 0101
 Title JEWS, CHRISTIANS, MUSL
 Instructor: MCDONOUGH, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 955
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	324/1576	4.73	4.58	4.30	4.46	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	851/1576	4.33	4.49	4.27	4.35	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	298/1342	4.75	4.61	4.32	4.46	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	969/1520	4.13	4.49	4.25	4.38	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	143/1465	4.87	4.54	4.12	4.22	4.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	375/1434	4.53	4.48	4.14	4.30	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	0	2	10	4.20	900/1547	4.20	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.69	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.47	4.10	4.24	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.76	4.47	4.55	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.93	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	298/1486	4.79	4.68	4.32	4.41	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	251/1489	4.86	4.70	4.32	4.38	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	2	1	2	2	1	2.88	1196/1277	2.88	4.26	4.03	4.04	2.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	253/1279	4.77	4.37	4.17	4.31	4.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	478/1270	4.69	4.53	4.35	4.53	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	342/1269	4.85	4.61	4.35	4.55	4.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	764/ 878	3.29	3.99	4.05	4.33	3.29	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.28	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.45	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.70	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 465 0101
 Title THE RENAISSANCE
 Instructor: GRUBB, JAMES S
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 956
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	3	18	4.63	471/1576	4.63	4.58	4.30	4.46	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	16	4.54	555/1576	4.54	4.49	4.27	4.35	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	369/1342	4.70	4.61	4.32	4.46	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	348/1520	4.65	4.49	4.25	4.38	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	264/1465	4.67	4.54	4.12	4.22	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	7	14	4.46	461/1434	4.46	4.48	4.14	4.30	4.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	5	14	4.38	718/1547	4.38	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	422/1574	4.91	4.69	4.64	4.69	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	180/1554	4.77	4.47	4.10	4.24	4.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	722/1488	4.63	4.76	4.47	4.55	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	23	4.92	501/1493	4.92	4.93	4.73	4.80	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	339/1486	4.75	4.68	4.32	4.41	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	378/1489	4.75	4.70	4.32	4.38	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	2	5	5	8	3.68	933/1277	3.68	4.26	4.03	4.04	3.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	488/1279	4.47	4.37	4.17	4.31	4.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	355/1270	4.80	4.53	4.35	4.53	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	386/1269	4.80	4.61	4.35	4.55	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	9	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 878	****	3.99	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.28	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.45	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.81	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.73	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.55	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.64	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	4.19	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.34	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	

Course-Section: HIST 465 0101
 Title THE RENAISSANCE
 Instructor: GRUBB, JAMES S
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 956
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	25	Non-major	8
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 478 0101
 Title CHINA, 1644 TO 1912
 Instructor: YIP, KA-CHE
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 957
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	235/1576	4.82	4.58	4.30	4.46	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	313/1576	4.73	4.49	4.27	4.35	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	240/1342	4.81	4.61	4.32	4.46	4.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	768/1520	4.33	4.49	4.25	4.38	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.54	4.12	4.22	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	184/1434	4.77	4.48	4.14	4.30	4.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	62/1547	4.95	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	14	7	4.33	1262/1574	4.33	4.69	4.64	4.69	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	0	7	8	4.31	649/1554	4.31	4.47	4.10	4.24	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	248/1488	4.91	4.76	4.47	4.55	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	557/1493	4.90	4.93	4.73	4.80	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	393/1486	4.71	4.68	4.32	4.41	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	364/1489	4.76	4.70	4.32	4.38	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	222/1277	4.65	4.26	4.03	4.04	4.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	657/1279	4.27	4.37	4.17	4.31	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	612/1270	4.53	4.53	4.35	4.53	4.53	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	626/1269	4.53	4.61	4.35	4.55	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	10	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 878	****	3.99	4.05	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 5	C 2	General 2	Under-grad 22 Non-major 6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 4	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 14	
			? 0		

Course-Section: HIST 484 0101
 Title GERM HIST: 1914 TO PRE
 Instructor: SPINNEY, RUSSEL
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 958
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	6	15	4.52	609/1576	4.52	4.58	4.30	4.46	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	11	4.30	891/1576	4.30	4.49	4.27	4.35	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	12	4.22	865/1342	4.22	4.61	4.32	4.46	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	3	9	8	4.05	1022/1520	4.05	4.49	4.25	4.38	4.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	15	4.52	353/1465	4.52	4.54	4.12	4.22	4.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	6	5	9	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.48	4.14	4.30	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	6	14	4.43	641/1547	4.43	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	645/1574	4.82	4.69	4.64	4.69	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	623/1554	4.33	4.47	4.10	4.24	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	3	18	4.65	680/1488	4.65	4.76	4.47	4.55	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	279/1493	4.96	4.93	4.73	4.80	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	6	14	4.43	778/1486	4.43	4.68	4.32	4.41	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	5	14	4.35	877/1489	4.35	4.70	4.32	4.38	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	4	8	8	4.10	656/1277	4.10	4.26	4.03	4.04	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	1	3	11	4.24	681/1279	4.24	4.37	4.17	4.31	4.24	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.53	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	167/1269	4.94	4.61	4.35	4.55	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	12	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	****/ 878	****	3.99	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.45	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.81	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 79	****	4.73	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 72	****	4.55	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 80	****	4.64	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 375	****	4.19	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.88	****	

Course-Section: HIST 484 0101
 Title GERM HIST: 1914 TO PRE
 Instructor: SPINNEY, RUSSEL
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 958
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	23	Non-major	10
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HIST 494B 0101
 Title COLD WAR CULTURE
 Instructor: BROWN, KATHRYN
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 959
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.58	4.30	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.49	4.27	4.35	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.61	4.32	4.46	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.49	4.25	4.38	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	264/1465	4.67	4.54	4.12	4.22	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	524/1434	4.40	4.48	4.14	4.30	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	924/1547	4.17	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	606/1574	4.83	4.69	4.64	4.69	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	316/1554	4.60	4.47	4.10	4.24	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1155/1488	4.20	4.76	4.47	4.55	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.93	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1003/1486	4.20	4.68	4.32	4.41	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	579/1489	4.60	4.70	4.32	4.38	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	856/1277	3.80	4.26	4.03	4.04	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.37	4.17	4.31	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	326/1270	4.83	4.53	4.35	4.53	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.61	4.35	4.55	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	770/ 878	3.25	3.99	4.05	4.33	3.25
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	61/ 85	4.50	4.81	4.72	4.77	4.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	67/ 79	4.00	4.73	4.69	4.69	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	47/ 72	4.50	4.55	4.64	4.64	4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	70/ 80	4.00	4.64	4.61	4.52	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	4.19	4.01	3.90	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 495A 0101
 Title PUBLIC HISTORY
 Instructor: MERINGOLO, DENI
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 960
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.58	4.30	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.49	4.27	4.35	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.61	4.32	4.46	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.49	4.25	4.38	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.54	4.12	4.22	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.48	4.14	4.30	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.69	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.47	4.10	4.24	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.76	4.47	4.55	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.93	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.41	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.70	4.32	4.38	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.37	4.17	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.53	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.61	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	3.99	4.05	4.33	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.81	4.72	4.77	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.73	4.69	4.69	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	59/ 72	4.00	4.55	4.64	4.64	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.64	4.61	4.52	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 495B 0101
 Title MUSIC AFR-AMER MIGRATI
 Instructor: SCOTT, MICHELLE
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 961
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.58	4.30	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	187/1576	4.86	4.49	4.27	4.35	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.61	4.32	4.46	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.49	4.25	4.38	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.54	4.12	4.22	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.48	4.14	4.30	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	280/1547	4.71	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	832/1574	4.71	4.69	4.64	4.69	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.47	4.10	4.24	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.76	4.47	4.55	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.93	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.70	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.26	4.03	4.04	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	194/1279	4.86	4.37	4.17	4.31	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.53	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.61	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	283/ 878	4.40	3.99	4.05	4.33	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: HIST 496 0101
 Title HISTORICAL RESEARCH
 Instructor: RUBIN, ANNE
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 962
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	1027/1576	4.19	4.58	4.30	4.46	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	279/1576	4.75	4.49	4.27	4.35	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	455/1342	4.63	4.61	4.32	4.46	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	631/1520	4.44	4.49	4.25	4.38	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.54	4.12	4.22	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	448/1434	4.47	4.48	4.14	4.30	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	457/1547	4.56	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	328/1574	4.93	4.69	4.64	4.69	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	449/1554	4.47	4.47	4.10	4.24	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	920/1488	4.47	4.76	4.47	4.55	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	658/1493	4.87	4.93	4.73	4.80	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	642/1486	4.53	4.68	4.32	4.41	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	888/1489	4.33	4.70	4.32	4.38	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1277	****	4.26	4.03	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	589/1279	4.36	4.37	4.17	4.31	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	523/1270	4.64	4.53	4.35	4.53	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	602/1269	4.57	4.61	4.35	4.55	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	258/ 878	4.44	3.99	4.05	4.33	4.44	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.81	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.73	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.55	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.64	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.19	4.01	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 497 0101
 Title HISTORICAL RESEARCH
 Instructor: FROIDE, AMY
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 963
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	485/1576	4.62	4.58	4.30	4.46	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	267/1576	4.77	4.49	4.27	4.35	4.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	298/1342	4.75	4.61	4.32	4.46	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	339/1520	4.67	4.49	4.25	4.38	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	596/1465	4.31	4.54	4.12	4.22	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	134/1434	4.85	4.48	4.14	4.30	4.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	160/1547	4.85	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	606/1574	4.83	4.69	4.64	4.69	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.47	4.10	4.24	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	624/1488	4.69	4.76	4.47	4.55	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	501/1493	4.92	4.93	4.73	4.80	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	231/1486	4.85	4.68	4.32	4.41	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	602/1489	4.58	4.70	4.32	4.38	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	2	1	0	0	2	2.80	1203/1277	2.80	4.26	4.03	4.04	2.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.37	4.17	4.31	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	234/1270	4.92	4.53	4.35	4.53	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	250/1269	4.92	4.61	4.35	4.55	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	3.99	4.05	4.33	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.81	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.73	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.55	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.64	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.19	4.01	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 603 0101
 Title THE AMERICAN COLONIES
 Instructor: KARS, MARJOLEIN
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 964
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	787/1576	4.40	4.58	4.30	4.43	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	759/1576	4.40	4.49	4.27	4.32	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.61	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	197/1520	4.80	4.49	4.25	4.36	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.54	4.12	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.48	4.14	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.69	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	316/1554	4.60	4.47	4.10	4.18	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.76	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.93	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	309/1489	4.80	4.70	4.32	4.38	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.26	4.03	4.08	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	219/1279	4.80	4.37	4.17	4.34	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.53	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	584/1269	4.60	4.61	4.35	4.55	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	3.99	4.05	4.11	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.81	4.72	4.79	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.73	4.69	4.77	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.55	4.64	4.70	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.64	4.61	4.70	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.19	4.01	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 607 0101
 Title FOUNDING OF AMER NATIO
 Instructor: BOUTON, TERRY
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 965
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.58	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	279/1576	4.75	4.49	4.27	4.32	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.61	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.49	4.25	4.36	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	206/1465	4.75	4.54	4.12	4.25	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	193/1434	4.75	4.48	4.14	4.35	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	238/1547	4.75	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	758/1574	4.75	4.69	4.64	4.75	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.47	4.10	4.18	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.76	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.93	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.70	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.26	4.03	4.08	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	665/1279	4.25	4.37	4.17	4.34	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.53	4.35	4.53	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	819/1269	4.25	4.61	4.35	4.55	4.25	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	61/ 85	4.50	4.81	4.72	4.79	4.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	57/ 79	4.50	4.73	4.69	4.77	4.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	47/ 72	4.50	4.55	4.64	4.70	4.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	48/ 80	4.50	4.64	4.61	4.70	4.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	152/ 375	4.50	4.19	4.01	4.10	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 621 0101
 Title THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR
 Instructor: RUBIN, ANNE
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 966
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.58	4.30	4.43	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.49	4.27	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.61	4.32	4.38	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.49	4.25	4.36	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.54	4.12	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.48	4.14	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.69	4.64	4.75	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.47	4.10	4.18	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.76	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.93	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.70	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.26	4.03	4.08	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.37	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.53	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.61	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	799/ 878	3.00	3.99	4.05	4.11	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 641 0101
 Title ORIG MOD AMER:1877-192
 Instructor: LINDENMEYER, KR
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 967
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	1058/1576	4.14	4.58	4.30	4.43	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	728/1576	4.43	4.49	4.27	4.32	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	812/1342	4.29	4.61	4.32	4.38	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	429/1520	4.57	4.49	4.25	4.36	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	231/1465	4.71	4.54	4.12	4.25	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.48	4.14	4.35	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	657/1547	4.43	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.69	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	623/1554	4.33	4.47	4.10	4.18	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	970/1488	4.43	4.76	4.47	4.52	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	683/1493	4.86	4.93	4.73	4.80	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	792/1486	4.43	4.68	4.32	4.37	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	789/1489	4.43	4.70	4.32	4.38	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	623/1277	4.14	4.26	4.03	4.08	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	938/1279	3.80	4.37	4.17	4.34	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	355/1270	4.80	4.53	4.35	4.53	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	584/1269	4.60	4.61	4.35	4.55	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	3.99	4.05	4.11	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 642 0101
 Title U.S.:1917 TO 1945
 Instructor: MERINGOLO, DENI
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 968
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.58	4.30	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.49	4.27	4.32	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.49	4.25	4.36	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.54	4.12	4.25	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.48	4.14	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.69	4.64	4.75	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.47	4.10	4.18	4.50

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.76	4.47	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.93	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.68	4.32	4.37	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.70	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	309/1277	4.50	4.26	4.03	4.08	4.50

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.37	4.17	4.34	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.53	4.35	4.53	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.61	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	3.99	4.05	4.11	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

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

Course-Section: HIST 647 0101
 Title HISTORY OF CIVIL RIGHT
 Instructor: SMEAD, HOWARD
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 969
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.58	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1576	4.67	4.49	4.27	4.32	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.61	4.32	4.38	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1520	4.67	4.49	4.25	4.36	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.54	4.12	4.25	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.48	4.14	4.35	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1547	4.67	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.69	4.64	4.75	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	263/1554	4.67	4.47	4.10	4.18	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.76	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.93	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.70	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	692/1277	4.00	4.26	4.03	4.08	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.37	4.17	4.34	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.53	4.35	4.53	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	773/1269	4.33	4.61	4.35	4.55	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	0	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	3	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	0	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	3	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 663 0101
 Title JEWS, CHRISTIANS, MUSL
 Instructor: MCDONOUGH, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 970
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.58	4.30	4.43	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1576	4.67	4.49	4.27	4.32	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1520	4.67	4.49	4.25	4.36	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1465	4.67	4.54	4.12	4.25	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.48	4.14	4.35	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.69	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.47	4.10	4.18	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.76	4.47	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.93	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.70	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1149/1277	3.00	4.26	4.03	4.08	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	335/1279	4.67	4.37	4.17	4.34	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.53	4.35	4.53	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.61	4.35	4.55	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	3.99	4.05	4.11	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 665 0101
 Title THE RENAISSANCE
 Instructor: GRUBB, JAMES S
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 971
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.58	4.30	4.43	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.49	4.27	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.61	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.49	4.25	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.54	4.12	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.48	4.14	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.69	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.47	4.10	4.18	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.76	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.93	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.70	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.26	4.03	4.08	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.37	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.53	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.61	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	3.99	4.05	4.11	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.81	4.72	4.79	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.73	4.69	4.77	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	4.55	4.64	4.70	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.64	4.61	4.70	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.19	4.01	4.10	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 684 0101
 Title GERMAN HIST 1914-PRESE
 Instructor: SPINNEY, RUSSEL
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 972
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.58	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.49	4.27	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.61	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.49	4.25	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.54	4.12	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.48	4.14	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.69	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.47	4.10	4.18	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.76	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.93	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.70	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.26	4.03	4.08	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.37	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.53	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.61	4.35	4.55	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 702 0101
 Title U.S. HISTORIOGRAPHY
 Instructor: BOUTON, TERRY
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 973
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	211/1576	4.84	4.58	4.30	4.43	4.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	920/1576	4.28	4.49	4.27	4.32	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	879/1342	4.20	4.61	4.32	4.38	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	614/1520	4.44	4.49	4.25	4.36	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	153/1465	4.84	4.54	4.12	4.25	4.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	383/1434	4.53	4.48	4.14	4.35	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	4	11	4.21	882/1547	4.21	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	881/1574	4.68	4.69	4.64	4.75	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	173/1554	4.79	4.47	4.10	4.18	4.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	834/1488	4.54	4.76	4.47	4.52	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.93	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	584/1486	4.58	4.68	4.32	4.37	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	565/1489	4.62	4.70	4.32	4.38	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	10	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/1277	****	4.26	4.03	4.08	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	236/1279	4.79	4.37	4.17	4.34	4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	582/1270	4.57	4.53	4.35	4.53	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	222/1269	4.93	4.61	4.35	4.55	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	6	9	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 878	****	3.99	4.05	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	35/ 85	4.93	4.81	4.72	4.79	4.93
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	1	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	34/ 79	4.92	4.73	4.69	4.77	4.92
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	38/ 72	4.77	4.55	4.64	4.70	4.77
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	34/ 80	4.80	4.64	4.61	4.70	4.80
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	1	0	1	2	11	4.47	156/ 375	4.47	4.19	4.01	4.10	4.47

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	9	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HIST 711 0101
 Title PRACTICUM IN PUBL HIST
 Instructor: MERINGOLO, DENI
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 974
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	541/1576	4.57	4.58	4.30	4.43	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	825/1576	4.36	4.49	4.27	4.32	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1342	****	4.61	4.32	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	476/1520	4.54	4.49	4.25	4.36	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	200/1465	4.77	4.54	4.12	4.25	4.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	134/1434	4.85	4.48	4.14	4.35	4.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	592/1547	4.46	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	758/1574	4.75	4.69	4.64	4.75	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	623/1554	4.33	4.47	4.10	4.18	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	970/1488	4.43	4.76	4.47	4.52	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	445/1493	4.93	4.93	4.73	4.80	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	871/1486	4.36	4.68	4.32	4.37	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	789/1489	4.43	4.70	4.32	4.38	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	943/1277	3.67	4.26	4.03	4.08	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	0	10	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.37	4.17	4.34	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.53	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	353/1269	4.83	4.61	4.35	4.55	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	252/ 878	4.45	3.99	4.05	4.11	4.45	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.36	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.37	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.47	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	55/ 85	4.75	4.81	4.72	4.79	4.75	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.73	4.69	4.77	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	39/ 72	4.75	4.55	4.64	4.70	4.75	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	48/ 80	4.50	4.64	4.61	4.70	4.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 375	****	4.19	4.01	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.76	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.88	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.65	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	11	
?	1			

Course-Section: HIST 713B 0101
 Title SEMINAR IN SOC HISTORY
 Instructor: SCOTT, MICHELLE
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 975
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.58	4.30	4.43	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1576	4.67	4.49	4.27	4.32	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.61	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.49	4.25	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.54	4.12	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.48	4.14	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.69	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	263/1554	4.67	4.47	4.10	4.18	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	666/1488	4.67	4.76	4.47	4.52	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.93	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.68	4.32	4.37	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.70	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.26	4.03	4.08	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.37	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.53	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.61	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	3.99	4.05	4.11	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 715B 0101
 Title COLD WAR CULTURE
 Instructor: BROWN, KATHRYN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 976
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	187/1576	4.88	4.58	4.30	4.43	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1311/1576	3.75	4.49	4.27	4.32	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.61	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	719/1520	4.38	4.49	4.25	4.36	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	206/1465	4.75	4.54	4.12	4.25	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	193/1434	4.75	4.48	4.14	4.35	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	805/1547	4.29	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	567/1574	4.86	4.69	4.64	4.75	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	772/1554	4.20	4.47	4.10	4.18	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1087/1488	4.29	4.76	4.47	4.52	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.93	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	530/1486	4.63	4.68	4.32	4.37	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	228/1489	4.88	4.70	4.32	4.38	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	429/1277	4.38	4.26	4.03	4.08	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.37	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	756/1270	4.38	4.53	4.35	4.53	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.61	4.35	4.55	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	589/ 878	3.83	3.99	4.05	4.11	3.83	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.81	4.72	4.79	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	52/ 79	4.67	4.73	4.69	4.77	4.67	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	57/ 72	4.33	4.55	4.64	4.70	4.33	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	40/ 80	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.70	4.67	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	180/ 375	4.00	4.19	4.01	4.10	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	1	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0

			Required for Majors	1	Graduate
			General	1	Under-grad
			Electives	0	### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			Other	3	