

Course Section: PSYC 100 0101  
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN  
 Enrollment: 172  
 Questionnaires: 70

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1393  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	3	6	15	23	21	3.78	1363/1669	4.27	4.22	4.23	4.02	3.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	6	20	27	14	3.65	1395/1666	4.25	4.13	4.19	4.11	3.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	2	14	33	17	3.94	1024/1421	4.28	4.15	4.24	4.11	3.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	29	2	1	10	20	6	3.69	1284/1617	4.12	4.15	4.15	3.99	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	4	6	22	33	4.29	524/1555	4.41	4.05	4.00	3.92	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	55	1	0	4	5	3	3.69	****/1543	4.15	4.00	4.06	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	9	14	22	22	3.81	1250/1647	4.19	4.15	4.12	4.06	3.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	3	64	4.96	357/1668	4.96	4.77	4.67	4.62	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	3	3	15	27	8	3.61	1312/1605	4.19	3.94	4.07	3.96	3.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	0	2	29	35	4.40	964/1514	4.65	4.35	4.39	4.32	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	9	58	4.82	732/1551	4.86	4.66	4.66	4.55	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	7	13	28	18	3.78	1225/1503	4.41	4.18	4.24	4.17	3.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	9	3	9	28	19	3.66	1277/1506	4.32	4.23	4.26	4.17	3.66	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	3	13	22	26	4.02	582/1311	4.29	4.08	3.85	3.68	4.02	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	9	5	11	7	7	2.95	1361/1490	3.73	3.87	4.05	3.85	2.95	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	3	7	13	7	10	3.35	1352/1502	3.87	4.18	4.26	4.06	3.35	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	5	2	11	9	13	3.58	1249/1489	4.21	4.22	4.29	4.07	3.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	29	32	4	1	2	1	1	2.33	****/1006	3.51	3.84	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	2	0	3	6	5	3	3.47	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	111/ 233	4.28	4.50	4.19	4.09	4.28	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	4	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	****/ 225	****	4.72	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	52	10	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	****/ 223	****	4.51	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	52	7	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	****/ 206	****	4.69	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	60	6	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	62	6	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	62	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	62	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	62	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	66	0	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	65	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	65	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	65	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	65	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	64	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	65	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	65	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	65	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	65	2	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: PSYC 100 0101  
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN  
 Enrollment: 172  
 Questionnaires: 70

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1393  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	3	A	20	Required for Majors	34	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	24						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	14	General	4	Under-grad	70	Non-major	69
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Course Section: PSYC 100 0201  
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN  
 Enrollment: 168  
 Questionnaires: 93

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1394  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	5	0	3	2	14	33	36	4.10	1103/1669	4.27	4.22	4.23	4.02	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	2	3	17	24	42	4.15	1001/1666	4.25	4.13	4.19	4.11	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	1	3	9	31	44	4.30	781/1421	4.28	4.15	4.24	4.11	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	32	2	3	8	18	25	4.09	981/1617	4.12	4.15	4.15	3.99	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	2	3	2	9	22	49	4.32	508/1555	4.41	4.05	4.00	3.92	4.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	54	3	0	8	8	14	3.91	1019/1543	4.15	4.00	4.06	3.86	3.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	2	14	27	44	4.30	817/1647	4.19	4.15	4.12	4.06	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	1	1	84	4.97	285/1668	4.96	4.77	4.67	4.62	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	1	1	3	21	32	12	3.74	1225/1605	4.19	3.94	4.07	3.96	3.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	1	3	20	61	4.62	663/1514	4.65	4.35	4.39	4.32	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	2	16	67	4.73	917/1551	4.86	4.66	4.66	4.55	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	2	0	8	28	48	4.40	730/1503	4.41	4.18	4.24	4.17	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	5	8	19	51	4.28	892/1506	4.32	4.23	4.26	4.17	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	1	1	5	16	61	4.61	219/1311	4.29	4.08	3.85	3.68	4.61	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	43	0	7	5	13	10	15	3.42	1202/1490	3.73	3.87	4.05	3.85	3.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	42	0	5	4	19	8	15	3.47	1312/1502	3.87	4.18	4.26	4.06	3.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	42	0	3	4	8	16	20	3.90	1125/1489	4.21	4.22	4.29	4.07	3.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	42	23	6	4	6	5	7	3.11	920/1006	3.51	3.84	4.00	3.81	3.11	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	81	1	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	81	0	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	****/ 233	4.28	4.50	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	82	4	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	****/ 225	****	4.72	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	82	5	2	0	1	0	3	3.33	****/ 223	****	4.51	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	82	5	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/ 206	****	4.69	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	85	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	85	6	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	84	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	85	4	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	84	5	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	88	0	2	2	0	0	1	2.20	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	87	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	87	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	87	3	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	87	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	84	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	86	1	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	86	4	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	86	4	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	86	4	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: PSYC 100 0201  
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN  
 Enrollment: 168  
 Questionnaires: 93

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1394  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	26	0.00-0.99	7	A	34	Required for Majors	26	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	26						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	13	Under-grad	93	Non-major	85
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	28				
				?	0						

Course Section: PSYC 100 0301  
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER  
 Enrollment: 159  
 Questionnaires: 78

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1395  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	0	0	4	17	50	4.65	419/1669	4.27	4.22	4.23	4.02	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	9	22	41	4.44	634/1666	4.25	4.13	4.19	4.11	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	1	2	9	20	39	4.32	755/1421	4.28	4.15	4.24	4.11	4.32	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	21	0	3	7	13	27	4.28	770/1617	4.12	4.15	4.15	3.99	4.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	1	2	0	5	19	41	4.45	398/1555	4.41	4.05	4.00	3.92	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	11	41	1	1	3	10	11	4.12	819/1543	4.15	4.00	4.06	3.86	4.12	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	2	5	16	22	24	3.88	1178/1647	4.19	4.15	4.12	4.06	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	1	68	4.99	143/1668	4.96	4.77	4.67	4.62	4.99	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	3	0	0	1	27	43	4.59	305/1605	4.19	3.94	4.07	3.96	4.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	1	0	1	17	49	4.66	584/1514	4.65	4.35	4.39	4.32	4.66	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	2	66	4.94	307/1551	4.86	4.66	4.66	4.55	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	3	18	47	4.65	412/1503	4.41	4.18	4.24	4.17	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	1	14	52	4.72	394/1506	4.32	4.23	4.26	4.17	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	5	1	4	8	17	32	4.21	477/1311	4.29	4.08	3.85	3.68	4.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	6	12	23	4.33	622/1490	3.73	3.87	4.05	3.85	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	36	0	2	0	1	9	30	4.55	595/1502	3.87	4.18	4.26	4.06	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	36	0	0	0	1	5	36	4.83	348/1489	4.21	4.22	4.29	4.07	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	36	31	2	1	3	2	3	3.27	****/1006	3.51	3.84	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	72	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	73	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 233	4.28	4.50	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	72	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.72	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	74	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 223	****	4.51	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	73	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.69	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	74	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	75	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	75	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	75	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	75	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	75	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	75	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	75	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	75	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	75	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	74	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	74	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	74	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	75	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	75	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: PSYC 100 0301  
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER  
 Enrollment: 159  
 Questionnaires: 78

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1395  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 3	A 19	Required for Majors 21	Graduate 0 Major 5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 21		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 5	General 13	Under-grad 78 Non-major 73
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 18	
			? 6		

Course Section: PSYC 100 0401  
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: SPIEGELMAN, JAS  
 Enrollment: 115  
 Questionnaires: 71

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1396  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	3	1	21	45	4.54	545/1669	4.27	4.22	4.23	4.02	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	13	55	4.76	243/1666	4.25	4.13	4.19	4.11	4.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	5	14	48	4.55	511/1421	4.28	4.15	4.24	4.11	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	20	0	4	6	6	34	4.40	641/1617	4.12	4.15	4.15	3.99	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	0	4	16	46	4.58	277/1555	4.41	4.05	4.00	3.92	4.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	45	1	0	2	6	15	4.42	503/1543	4.15	4.00	4.06	3.86	4.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	13	54	4.75	213/1647	4.19	4.15	4.12	4.06	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	2	0	67	4.94	428/1668	4.96	4.77	4.67	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	11	56	4.81	139/1605	4.19	3.94	4.07	3.96	4.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	63	4.91	170/1514	4.65	4.35	4.39	4.32	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	66	4.94	307/1551	4.86	4.66	4.66	4.55	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	4	61	4.81	210/1503	4.41	4.18	4.24	4.17	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	4	12	50	4.60	547/1506	4.32	4.23	4.26	4.17	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	3	3	6	13	43	4.32	397/1311	4.29	4.08	3.85	3.68	4.32	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	2	4	6	8	30	4.20	742/1490	3.73	3.87	4.05	3.85	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	5	3	4	6	31	4.12	962/1502	3.87	4.18	4.26	4.06	4.12	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	1	1	5	6	36	4.53	657/1489	4.21	4.22	4.29	4.07	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	24	23	2	1	4	7	10	3.92	594/1006	3.51	3.84	4.00	3.81	3.92	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	5	1	1	0	4	5	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	57	0	5	1	1	3	4	3.00	****/ 233	4.28	4.50	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	7	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	****/ 225	****	4.72	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	57	6	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	****/ 223	****	4.51	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	57	6	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	****/ 206	****	4.69	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	58	8	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	11	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	13	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	9	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	9	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	59	0	5	0	1	4	2	2.83	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	59	0	4	1	1	1	5	3.17	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	59	9	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	59	5	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	59	7	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	2	1	1	3	10	4.06	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	0	2	0	0	4	11	4.29	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	4	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	57	7	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	9	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: PSYC 100 0401  
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: SPIEGELMAN, JAS  
 Enrollment: 115  
 Questionnaires: 71

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1396  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	3	A	19	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	32						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	13	Under-grad	71	Non-major	63
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	28				
				?	3						



Course Section: PSYC 200 0101  
 Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS  
 Instructor: SCHULTZ, DAVID  
 Enrollment: 92  
 Questionnaires: 91

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1397  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	48	0	1	5	5	11	21	4.07	1131/1669	4.25	4.22	4.23	4.34	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	48	0	1	5	9	10	18	3.91	1235/1666	4.22	4.13	4.19	4.29	3.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	48	0	2	4	7	12	18	3.93	1033/1421	4.04	4.15	4.24	4.35	3.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	48	17	2	2	5	5	12	3.88	1179/1617	4.13	4.15	4.15	4.24	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	49	0	1	4	0	11	26	4.36	477/1555	4.24	4.05	4.00	3.96	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	49	31	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	****/1543	4.01	4.00	4.06	4.10	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	49	0	0	3	3	6	30	4.50	481/1647	4.49	4.15	4.12	4.19	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	49	0	0	0	1	14	27	4.62	1115/1668	4.74	4.77	4.67	4.59	4.62	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	56	1	4	0	7	14	9	3.71	1249/1605	3.96	3.94	4.07	4.15	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	50	0	2	1	1	7	30	4.51	787/1514	4.59	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.51	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	49	0	0	1	1	8	32	4.69	986/1551	4.75	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	50	0	1	1	2	17	20	4.32	823/1503	4.40	4.18	4.24	4.29	4.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	50	0	5	2	4	12	18	3.88	1189/1506	4.33	4.23	4.26	4.33	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	50	0	1	2	3	10	25	4.37	365/1311	4.41	4.08	3.85	3.96	4.37	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	68	0	1	2	3	8	9	3.96	902/1490	3.96	3.87	4.05	4.11	3.96	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	68	0	0	2	3	5	13	4.26	873/1502	4.08	4.18	4.26	4.31	4.26	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	68	0	0	1	1	3	18	4.65	543/1489	4.34	4.22	4.29	4.36	4.65	
4. Were special techniques successful	68	7	2	0	5	3	6	3.69	****/1006	3.89	3.84	4.00	3.99	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	90	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	90	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	90	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	****	4.51	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	90	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	4.69	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	90	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	17	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	8	Under-grad	91	Non-major	77
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	2						

Course Section: PSYC 200 0201  
 Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS  
 Instructor: KATENKAMP, ANGE  
 Enrollment: 93  
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1398  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	7	12	32	4.42	705/1669	4.25	4.22	4.23	4.34	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	12	40	4.77	231/1666	4.22	4.13	4.19	4.29	4.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	11	40	4.75	280/1421	4.04	4.15	4.24	4.35	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	10	0	1	6	11	23	4.37	684/1617	4.13	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.37	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	4	1	7	10	23	4.04	747/1555	4.24	4.05	4.00	3.96	4.04	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	2	8	13	19	4.17	759/1543	4.01	4.00	4.06	4.10	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	3	10	36	4.60	367/1647	4.49	4.15	4.12	4.19	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	48	4.96	285/1668	4.74	4.77	4.67	4.59	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	0	1	5	20	14	4.18	779/1605	3.96	3.94	4.07	4.15	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	44	4.84	291/1514	4.59	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	7	42	4.75	880/1551	4.75	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	9	38	4.67	386/1503	4.40	4.18	4.24	4.29	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	7	42	4.75	353/1506	4.33	4.23	4.26	4.33	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	3	6	40	4.63	209/1311	4.41	4.08	3.85	3.96	4.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	1	3	5	13	4.22	726/1490	3.96	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	1	1	3	8	10	4.09	982/1502	4.08	4.18	4.26	4.31	4.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	2	0	3	7	11	4.09	1018/1489	4.34	4.22	4.29	4.36	4.09	
4. Were special techniques successful	30	9	1	1	3	2	7	3.93	581/1006	3.89	3.84	4.00	3.99	3.93	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 33	Required for Majors	15
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 4	C 2	General	9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 9	D 0		Under-grad 53
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	24
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	7	14	23	4.26	901/1669	4.25	4.22	4.23	4.34	4.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	7	17	17	3.98	1136/1666	4.22	4.13	4.19	4.29	3.98	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	2	13	16	9	3.43	1261/1421	4.04	4.15	4.24	4.35	3.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	5	18	19	4.13	934/1617	4.13	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	12	26	4.33	500/1555	4.24	4.05	4.00	3.96	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	5	8	14	17	3.85	1068/1543	4.01	4.00	4.06	4.10	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	8	10	27	4.37	713/1647	4.49	4.15	4.12	4.19	4.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	30	4.65	1077/1668	4.74	4.77	4.67	4.59	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	1	9	15	11	4.00	918/1605	3.96	3.94	4.07	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	7	13	26	4.41	939/1514	4.59	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	5	38	4.80	788/1551	4.75	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	4	4	15	22	4.22	905/1503	4.40	4.18	4.24	4.29	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	3	9	28	4.36	809/1506	4.33	4.23	4.26	4.33	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	7	13	23	4.24	451/1311	4.41	4.08	3.85	3.96	4.24	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	2	6	9	8	3.70	1069/1490	3.96	3.87	4.05	4.11	3.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	2	2	4	8	11	3.89	1129/1502	4.08	4.18	4.26	4.31	3.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	1	1	3	6	15	4.27	914/1489	4.34	4.22	4.29	4.36	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	6	1	2	2	9	6	3.85	625/1006	3.89	3.84	4.00	3.99	3.85	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.51	4.35	4.71	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.50	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	42	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: PSYC 200 0401  
 Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS  
 Instructor: BEALL, LISA C  
 Enrollment: 86  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1399  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A	20	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	1	Major	8
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	4	Under-grad	45	Non-major	38
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course Section: PSYC 210 0101  
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING  
 Instructor: CATANIA, A. CHA  
 Enrollment: 62  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1400  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	4	4	5	8	3.81	1352/1669	4.06	4.22	4.23	4.34	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	3	11	3.95	1164/1666	4.30	4.13	4.19	4.29	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	1	8	8	3.86	1089/1421	4.26	4.15	4.24	4.35	3.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1179/1617	4.15	4.15	4.15	4.24	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	7	9	4.19	611/1555	4.03	4.05	4.00	3.96	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1410/1543	3.63	4.00	4.06	4.10	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	4	15	4.52	458/1647	4.64	4.15	4.12	4.19	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1668	4.83	4.77	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	5	0	4	8	4	3.29	1446/1605	3.80	3.94	4.07	4.15	3.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	2	6	11	4.19	1118/1514	4.53	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.19	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	256/1551	4.92	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	2	2	5	9	3.71	1255/1503	4.15	4.18	4.24	4.29	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	9	3	6	3.48	1327/1506	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.33	3.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	3	6	6	5	3.65	854/1311	4.12	4.08	3.85	3.96	3.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	6	0	5	0	3	2.57	1425/1490	3.14	3.87	4.05	4.11	2.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	3	2	7	3.93	1096/1502	4.04	4.18	4.26	4.31	3.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	2	5	2	4	3.43	1310/1489	3.68	4.22	4.29	4.36	3.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	10	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	3.99	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	16
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	B 7		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	16
			? 1		

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

Course Section: PSYC 210 0201  
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING  
 Instructor: SIGURDSSON, S  
 Enrollment: 65  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1401  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	10	15	4.31	840/1669	4.06	4.22	4.23	4.34	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	21	4.66	372/1666	4.30	4.13	4.19	4.29	4.66	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	22	4.66	405/1421	4.26	4.15	4.24	4.35	4.66	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	626/1617	4.15	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	7	3	14	3.86	971/1555	4.03	4.05	4.00	3.96	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	21	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	659/1543	3.63	4.00	4.06	4.10	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	24	4.76	213/1647	4.64	4.15	4.12	4.19	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	19	4.66	1077/1668	4.83	4.77	4.67	4.59	4.66	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	11	11	4.32	604/1605	3.80	3.94	4.07	4.15	4.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	27	4.86	257/1514	4.53	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	27	4.90	539/1551	4.92	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	6	20	4.59	482/1503	4.15	4.18	4.24	4.29	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	25	4.79	299/1506	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.33	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	4	3	20	4.59	223/1311	4.12	4.08	3.85	3.96	4.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	1	3	1	7	3.71	1062/1490	3.14	3.87	4.05	4.11	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	950/1502	4.04	4.18	4.26	4.31	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	1107/1489	3.68	4.22	4.29	4.36	3.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	10	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	3.99	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	17	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	8	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	5
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	9	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	26				

Course Section: PSYC 215 0101  
 Title PARAPROFESSIONAL RES C  
 Instructor: LEISEY, KIM  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1402  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	4	11	13	4.32	828/1669	4.43	4.22	4.23	4.34	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	6	16	4.36	752/1666	4.34	4.13	4.19	4.29	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	8	17	4.50	557/1421	4.20	4.15	4.24	4.35	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	7	7	13	4.14	922/1617	4.07	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	4	3	15	3.89	947/1555	3.79	4.05	4.00	3.96	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	6	10	8	3.71	1167/1543	3.83	4.00	4.06	4.10	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	3	6	15	4.11	992/1647	3.83	4.15	4.12	4.19	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	15	9	4.32	604/1605	4.13	3.94	4.07	4.15	4.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	3	22	4.61	679/1514	4.53	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	24	4.79	825/1551	4.73	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	8	18	4.57	491/1503	4.54	4.18	4.24	4.29	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	4	20	4.54	613/1506	4.54	4.23	4.26	4.33	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	2	1	6	5	9	3.78	774/1311	4.03	4.08	3.85	3.96	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	604/1490	4.46	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	604/1502	4.77	4.18	4.26	4.31	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	585/1489	4.53	4.22	4.29	4.36	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	344/1006	4.42	3.84	4.00	3.99	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 6	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 29 Non-major 28
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 8	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 24	
			? 1		

Course Section: PSYC 215 0201  
 Title PARAPROFESSIONAL RES C  
 Instructor: LEISEY, KIM  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1403  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	7	14	4.55	545/1669	4.43	4.22	4.23	4.34	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	11	4.32	801/1666	4.34	4.13	4.19	4.29	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	5	9	3.91	1061/1421	4.20	4.15	4.24	4.35	3.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	9	7	4.00	1029/1617	4.07	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	5	8	6	3.68	1118/1555	3.79	4.05	4.00	3.96	3.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	7	9	6	3.95	957/1543	3.83	4.00	4.06	4.10	3.95	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	7	5	6	3.55	1377/1647	3.83	4.15	4.12	4.19	3.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	4	9	3	3.94	1039/1605	4.13	3.94	4.07	4.15	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	877/1514	4.53	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	1000/1551	4.73	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	556/1503	4.54	4.18	4.24	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	13	4.55	604/1506	4.54	4.23	4.26	4.33	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	5	5	11	4.29	426/1311	4.03	4.08	3.85	3.96	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	417/1490	4.46	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1502	4.77	4.18	4.26	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	753/1489	4.53	4.22	4.29	4.36	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	235/1006	4.42	3.84	4.00	3.99	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	4.20	****	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course Section: PSYC 230 0201  
 Title PSYCHOLOGY AND CULTURE  
 Instructor: CHEAH, CHARISSA  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1404  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	8	17	4.68	375/1669	4.68	4.22	4.23	4.34	4.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	293/1666	4.72	4.13	4.19	4.29	4.72	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	8	14	4.44	632/1421	4.44	4.15	4.24	4.35	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	11	12	4.40	641/1617	4.40	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	10	11	4.28	533/1555	4.28	4.05	4.00	3.96	4.28	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	10	11	4.24	680/1543	4.24	4.00	4.06	4.10	4.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	3	20	4.68	292/1647	4.68	4.15	4.12	4.19	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	825/1668	4.84	4.77	4.67	4.59	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	9	14	4.61	298/1605	4.61	3.94	4.07	4.15	4.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	291/1514	4.84	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.66	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	1	22	4.80	220/1503	4.80	4.18	4.24	4.29	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	131/1506	4.92	4.23	4.26	4.33	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	5	18	4.60	219/1311	4.60	4.08	3.85	3.96	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	279/1490	4.74	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.74	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	358/1502	4.79	4.18	4.26	4.31	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	289/1489	4.89	4.22	4.29	4.36	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	209/1006	4.58	3.84	4.00	3.99	4.58	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	7
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 26
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: PSYC 285 0101  
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN  
 Enrollment: 156  
 Questionnaires: 82

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1405  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	2	0	9	21	48	4.41	719/1669	4.46	4.22	4.23	4.34	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	8	8	30	33	4.07	1054/1666	4.36	4.13	4.19	4.29	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	4	6	8	22	40	4.10	932/1421	4.35	4.15	4.24	4.35	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	27	1	1	10	22	19	4.08	987/1617	4.24	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	1	6	23	44	4.39	445/1555	4.20	4.05	4.00	3.96	4.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	41	2	2	10	12	12	3.79	1115/1543	4.03	4.00	4.06	4.10	3.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	3	8	23	44	4.38	682/1647	4.47	4.15	4.12	4.19	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	19	61	4.76	952/1668	4.69	4.77	4.67	4.59	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	1	0	15	25	24	4.09	857/1605	4.26	3.94	4.07	4.15	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	2	8	26	40	4.28	1064/1514	4.53	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.28	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	4	19	57	4.66	1028/1551	4.82	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.66	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	6	8	32	30	4.09	1020/1503	4.40	4.18	4.24	4.29	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	6	5	25	38	4.08	1038/1506	4.50	4.23	4.26	4.33	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	3	3	11	15	45	4.25	451/1311	4.12	4.08	3.85	3.96	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	32	0	3	1	15	10	21	3.90	956/1490	3.84	3.87	4.05	4.11	3.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	33	0	1	1	13	11	23	4.10	975/1502	3.86	4.18	4.26	4.31	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	1	2	4	10	32	4.43	776/1489	4.25	4.22	4.29	4.36	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	33	28	3	2	6	6	4	3.29	862/1006	3.41	3.84	4.00	3.99	3.29	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	79	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	80	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	79	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.72	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	79	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.51	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	79	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.69	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	78	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	79	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	79	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	79	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	79	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	80	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	79	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	80	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	80	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	80	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	80	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	80	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	80	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	80	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	80	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: PSYC 285 0101  
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN  
 Enrollment: 156  
 Questionnaires: 82

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1405  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 2	A 26	Required for Majors 20	Graduate 0 Major 13
28-55	16	1.00-1.99 0	B 31		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 5	C 10	General 20	Under-grad 82 Non-major 69
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 12	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 15	F 0	Electives 6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 23	
			? 2		

Course Section: PSYC 285 0201  
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: RESTA, PETER  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1406  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	2	5	3	26	4.47	633/1669	4.46	4.22	4.23	4.34	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	9	26	4.69	319/1666	4.36	4.13	4.19	4.29	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	32	4.89	164/1421	4.35	4.15	4.24	4.35	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	3	1	7	18	4.38	673/1617	4.24	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	1	1	12	18	4.08	721/1555	4.20	4.05	4.00	3.96	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	6	0	3	4	9	13	4.10	832/1543	4.03	4.00	4.06	4.10	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	1	10	22	4.49	515/1647	4.47	4.15	4.12	4.19	4.49	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	34	4.94	428/1668	4.69	4.77	4.67	4.59	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	2	1	8	19	4.47	423/1605	4.26	3.94	4.07	4.15	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	29	4.78	408/1514	4.53	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	32	4.89	567/1551	4.82	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	2	11	20	4.44	653/1503	4.40	4.18	4.24	4.29	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	30	4.81	286/1506	4.50	4.23	4.26	4.33	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	2	7	26	4.69	179/1311	4.12	4.08	3.85	3.96	4.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	2	3	2	3	6	3.50	1154/1490	3.84	3.87	4.05	4.11	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	4	2	1	2	6	3.27	1370/1502	3.86	4.18	4.26	4.31	3.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	1	6	2	6	3.87	1142/1489	4.25	4.22	4.29	4.36	3.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	13	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1006	3.41	3.84	4.00	3.99	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.36	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.59	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 23	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 6
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C 0	General 6	Under-grad 38	Non-major 32
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	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 20		
				? 1			

Course Section: PSYC 285 0301  
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: DAHLQUIST, LYNN  
 Enrollment: 64  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1407  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	1	8	34	4.62	448/1669	4.46	4.22	4.23	4.34	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	0	10	33	4.62	412/1666	4.36	4.13	4.19	4.29	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	14	29	4.60	466/1421	4.35	4.15	4.24	4.35	4.60		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	19	0	1	5	6	14	4.27	790/1617	4.24	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	8	11	21	4.14	676/1555	4.20	4.05	4.00	3.96	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	25	0	2	3	4	11	4.20	723/1543	4.03	4.00	4.06	4.10	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	0	3	3	36	4.53	446/1647	4.47	4.15	4.12	4.19	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	43	4.98	214/1668	4.69	4.77	4.67	4.59	4.98	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	0	0	17	20	4.45	448/1605	4.26	3.94	4.07	4.15	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	40	4.89	223/1514	4.53	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	41	4.93	358/1551	4.82	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	4	38	4.80	231/1503	4.40	4.18	4.24	4.29	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	7	36	4.80	299/1506	4.50	4.23	4.26	4.33	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	1	6	10	24	4.39	341/1311	4.12	4.08	3.85	3.96	4.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	2	10	11	4.39	567/1490	3.84	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.39	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	540/1502	3.86	4.18	4.26	4.31	4.61	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	358/1489	4.25	4.22	4.29	4.36	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	6	3	0	4	5	5	3.53	753/1006	3.41	3.84	4.00	3.99	3.53	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.36	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	A 18	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 14
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	0	B 17			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C 3	General 8	Under-grad 46	Non-major 32
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	21	
?	1			

Course Section: PSYC 285 0401  
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: PARKER, LESLIE  
 Enrollment: 77  
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1408  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	2	10	13	34	4.34	816/1669	4.46	4.22	4.23	4.34	4.34	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	4	12	17	25	4.03	1076/1666	4.36	4.13	4.19	4.29	4.03	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	4	16	18	18	3.79	1121/1421	4.35	4.15	4.24	4.35	3.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	44	1	0	5	4	5	3.80	****/1617	4.24	4.15	4.15	4.24	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	2	1	10	13	27	4.17	644/1555	4.20	4.05	4.00	3.96	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	50	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	****/1543	4.03	4.00	4.06	4.10	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	2	17	37	4.47	532/1647	4.47	4.15	4.12	4.19	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	52	5	4.09	1487/1668	4.69	4.77	4.67	4.59	4.09	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	14	20	16	4.04	891/1605	4.26	3.94	4.07	4.15	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	3	9	22	25	4.17	1136/1514	4.53	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	8	49	4.80	806/1551	4.82	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	10	18	30	4.29	852/1503	4.40	4.18	4.24	4.29	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	4	6	11	36	4.33	848/1506	4.50	4.23	4.26	4.33	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	19	4	9	12	7	8	3.15	1088/1311	4.12	4.08	3.85	3.96	3.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	4	6	5	10	13	3.58	1128/1490	3.84	3.87	4.05	4.11	3.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	5	5	6	13	10	3.46	1315/1502	3.86	4.18	4.26	4.31	3.46	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	4	0	8	12	15	3.87	1137/1489	4.25	4.22	4.29	4.36	3.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	35	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/1006	3.41	3.84	4.00	3.99	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	8	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	3	1	0	1	1	2.33	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.36	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	56	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.59	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	58	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	58	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	57	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	58	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	58	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	58	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	58	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	58	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	3	A 10	Required for Majors 12
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B 28	Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 12	Major 22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	D 0	General 9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Under-grad 61
				P 0	Non-major 39
				I 0	Electives 2
					Other 30
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant





Course Section: PSYC 304 0101  
 Title ADOLESCENT PSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN  
 Enrollment: 149  
 Questionnaires: 86

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1409  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	5	0	3	6	18	28	26	3.84	1332/1669	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.28	3.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	4	7	23	20	27	3.73	1348/1666	4.03	4.13	4.19	4.20	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	4	8	17	21	31	3.83	1106/1421	4.03	4.15	4.24	4.25	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	57	0	0	9	8	7	3.92	1154/1617	4.08	4.15	4.15	4.22	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	3	3	5	10	25	35	4.08	728/1555	4.17	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	64	1	1	3	3	8	4.00	****/1543	4.13	4.00	4.06	4.14	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	0	10	17	53	4.49	498/1647	3.94	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.49	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	0	0	33	46	4.58	1138/1668	4.72	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	1	6	13	28	19	3.87	1124/1605	4.09	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	3	12	18	45	4.35	1013/1514	4.47	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	3	6	70	4.81	760/1551	4.85	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	2	10	10	28	28	3.90	1172/1503	4.24	4.18	4.24	4.28	3.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	6	12	18	38	3.99	1090/1506	4.34	4.23	4.26	4.30	3.99	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	4	5	9	21	38	4.09	542/1311	3.87	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	34	0	5	5	12	13	17	3.62	1112/1490	4.12	3.87	4.05	4.11	3.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	34	0	0	3	5	14	30	4.37	790/1502	4.58	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.37	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	34	0	0	3	3	13	33	4.46	730/1489	4.65	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	34	8	7	3	12	10	12	3.39	819/1006	3.44	3.84	4.00	4.10	3.39	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	83	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	85	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	85	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	4.15	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	1	Major	11
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	40						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	17	C	17	General	22	Under-grad	85	Non-major	75
84-150	21	3.00-3.49	22	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	43				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	2	3	8	17	4.33	816/1669	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	2	3	8	17	4.33	777/1666	4.03	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	1	4	8	16	4.23	831/1421	4.03	4.15	4.24	4.25	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	14	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	801/1617	4.08	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	3	4	5	18	4.27	550/1555	4.17	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	14	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	807/1543	4.13	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	4	4	8	3	10	3.38	1454/1647	3.94	4.15	4.12	4.14	3.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	4	26	4	4.87	788/1668	4.72	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	12	13	4.31	617/1605	4.09	3.94	4.07	4.09	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	8	19	4.59	703/1514	4.47	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	539/1551	4.85	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	8	19	4.59	482/1503	4.24	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	5	23	4.70	433/1506	4.34	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	2	2	5	7	7	3.65	854/1311	3.87	4.08	3.85	3.97	3.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	4	23	4.63	364/1490	4.12	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	6	24	4.80	336/1502	4.58	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	5	25	4.83	348/1489	4.65	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	18	2	0	4	2	4	3.50	759/1006	3.44	3.84	4.00	4.10	3.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.13	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.12	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	8	Under-grad	33	Non-major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	9	
?	0			

Course Section: PSYC 308 0101  
 Title CHILD MALTREATMENT  
 Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1411  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	12	0	2	2	5	13	16	4.03	1159/1669	4.03	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.03	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	0	5	4	13	16	4.05	1065/1666	4.05	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	0	4	4	4	12	14	3.74	1141/1421	3.74	4.15	4.24	4.25	3.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	12	1	0	4	8	11	14	3.95	1112/1617	3.95	4.15	4.15	4.22	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	0	5	4	6	7	16	3.66	1141/1555	3.66	4.05	4.00	4.03	3.66	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	11	2	5	1	8	11	3.78	1123/1543	3.78	4.00	4.06	4.14	3.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	12	0	2	4	6	9	17	3.92	1137/1647	3.92	4.15	4.12	4.14	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	0	0	0	0	6	32	4.84	825/1668	4.84	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	1	2	3	8	7	12	3.75	1210/1605	3.75	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	4	8	26	4.58	715/1514	4.58	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	2	1	5	30	4.66	1042/1551	4.66	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.66	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	4	4	5	25	4.34	788/1503	4.34	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.34	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	4	2	5	4	23	4.05	1047/1506	4.05	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	2	2	2	8	24	4.32	405/1311	4.32	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.32	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	2	2	4	12	4.14	778/1490	4.14	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	1	0	0	4	16	4.62	531/1502	4.62	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.62	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	1	0	0	5	15	4.57	622/1489	4.57	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	29	4	1	2	1	5	8	4.00	479/1006	4.00	3.84	4.00	4.10	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.13	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	49	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	4.15	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	49	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 19		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	17
84-150	23	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	50
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	14
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course Section: PSYC 320 0101  
 Title PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSESSME  
 Instructor: ALLEN, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1412  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	10	0	4	2	6	5	6	3.30	1550/1669	3.30	4.22	4.23	4.28	3.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	3	4	3	9	4	3.30	1534/1666	3.30	4.13	4.19	4.20	3.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	0	3	3	6	9	2	3.17	1329/1421	3.17	4.15	4.24	4.25	3.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	21	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1617	****	4.15	4.15	4.22	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	6	6	9	3.91	922/1555	3.91	4.05	4.00	4.03	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	10	20	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1543	****	4.00	4.06	4.14	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	1	3	3	2	10	4	3.41	1440/1647	3.41	4.15	4.12	4.14	3.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	0	0	0	0	21	2	4.09	1487/1668	4.09	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.09	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	4	1	5	9	1	3.10	1496/1605	3.10	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	1	1	5	5	11	4.04	1188/1514	4.04	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.04	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	1176/1551	4.52	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	3	2	3	7	8	3.65	1281/1503	3.65	4.18	4.24	4.28	3.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	5	1	4	2	11	3.57	1307/1506	3.57	4.23	4.26	4.30	3.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	22	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1311	****	4.08	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	3	2	5	2	4	3.13	1311/1490	3.13	3.87	4.05	4.11	3.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	1	4	3	7	3.88	1135/1502	3.88	4.18	4.26	4.28	3.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	883/1489	4.31	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	5	2	1	4	3	2	3.17	902/1006	3.17	3.84	4.00	4.10	3.17	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	14
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 10		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	19
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	16
			? 1		

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

Course Section: PSYC 324 0101  
 Title INTERVIEWING TECHNIQUE  
 Instructor: FOX, MARY H  
 Enrollment: 61  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1413  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	3	0	1	2	5	13	9	3.90	1288/1669	3.90	4.22	4.23	4.28	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	6	9	6	9	3.60	1432/1666	3.60	4.13	4.19	4.20	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	2	6	8	12	4.07	943/1421	4.07	4.15	4.24	4.25	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	2	2	9	17	4.37	684/1617	4.37	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.37	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	5	12	9	3.90	947/1555	3.90	4.05	4.00	4.03	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	3	14	11	4.13	795/1543	4.13	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	4	8	4	4	10	3.27	1495/1647	3.27	4.15	4.12	4.14	3.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	788/1668	4.87	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	1	5	13	5	3.80	1172/1605	3.80	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	3	10	7	9	3.67	1352/1514	3.67	4.35	4.39	4.46	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	7	22	4.70	986/1551	4.70	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	8	8	10	3.73	1245/1503	3.73	4.18	4.24	4.28	3.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	8	8	11	3.87	1194/1506	3.87	4.23	4.26	4.30	3.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	4	4	9	3	6	3.12	1100/1311	3.12	4.08	3.85	3.97	3.12	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	1	3	4	5	3.79	1016/1490	3.79	3.87	4.05	4.11	3.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	585/1489	4.62	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	3	2	0	3	1	5	3.64	711/1006	3.64	3.84	4.00	4.10	3.64	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	180/ 226	3.67	4.08	4.20	4.17	3.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	1	2	0	3	3	3.56	202/ 233	3.56	4.50	4.19	4.13	3.56	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	2	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.72	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	****/ 223	****	4.51	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	****/ 206	****	4.69	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.47	****	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 23	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 4	C 0	General	12
84-150	15	3.00-3.49 11	D 0	Under-grad	33
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Electives	0
				Other	9
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course Section: PSYC 330 8020  
 Title CHILD DEVEL AND CULTUR  
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, ROBY  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1414  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	10	4.75	269/1669	4.75	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	243/1666	4.75	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	466/1421	4.60	4.15	4.24	4.25	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	219/1617	4.75	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	225/1555	4.67	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	180/1543	4.75	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	150/1647	4.83	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	1190/1668	4.50	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	268/1605	4.64	3.94	4.07	4.09	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.66	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	126/1503	4.91	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	249/1506	4.83	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	489/1311	4.18	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	389/1490	4.60	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	0	8	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	378/1489	4.80	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	217/1006	4.56	3.84	4.00	4.10	4.56	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.13	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PSYC 331 0101  
 Title: EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I  
 Instructor: WARREN, KIMBERL  
 Enrollment: 48  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1415  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	9	4.32	840/1669	4.60	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	868/1666	4.77	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.26	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	7	4.21	847/1421	4.68	4.15	4.24	4.25	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	684/1617	4.67	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	584/1555	4.05	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	598/1543	4.52	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	713/1647	4.57	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	731/1668	4.99	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	9	4	2	3.53	1343/1605	4.10	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	993/1514	4.50	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.37	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	1254/1551	4.60	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	4	6	5	3.72	1250/1503	4.39	4.18	4.24	4.28	3.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	3	10	4.11	1025/1506	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	1	2	4	8	3.88	712/1311	4.43	4.08	3.85	3.97	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	849/1490	4.18	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	2	2	5	6	3.81	1172/1502	4.49	4.18	4.26	4.28	3.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	3	2	2	7	3.56	1253/1489	4.44	4.22	4.29	4.35	3.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	1	2	3	1	1	2.88	947/1006	3.91	3.84	4.00	4.10	2.88	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	136/ 226	4.10	4.08	4.20	4.17	4.11	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	146/ 233	4.59	4.50	4.19	4.13	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	2	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	187/ 225	4.67	4.72	4.50	4.45	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	134/ 223	4.57	4.51	4.35	4.27	4.38	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	56/ 206	4.72	4.69	4.15	4.08	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 112	4.17	4.06	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 97	4.00	3.56	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	4.00	3.63	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 105	4.17	4.06	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 98	4.50	3.39	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	



Course Section: PSYC 331 0101  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I  
 Instructor: WARREN, KIMBERL  
 Enrollment: 48  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1415  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course Section: PSYC 331 0201  
 Title: EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I  
 Instructor: STAPLETON, LAUR (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 84  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1416  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	12	24	4.62	448/1669	4.60	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	34	4.89	110/1666	4.77	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	6	30	4.78	242/1421	4.68	4.15	4.24	4.25	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	1	5	29	4.80	161/1617	4.67	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	2	6	11	15	4.15	665/1555	4.05	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	2	12	20	4.53	371/1543	4.52	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	5	30	4.76	213/1647	4.57	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	36	5.00	1/1668	4.99	4.77	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	7	26	4.79	151/1605	4.10	3.94	4.07	4.09	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	34	4.94	113/1514	4.50	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	35	4.97	154/1551	4.60	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	34	4.94	76/1503	4.39	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	32	4.89	188/1506	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	3	8	22	4.58	232/1311	4.43	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	3	10	16	4.26	692/1490	4.18	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.26	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	7	23	4.71	450/1502	4.49	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	389/1489	4.44	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	8	2	0	3	3	14	4.23	393/1006	3.91	3.84	4.00	4.10	4.23	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	3	0	2	4	6	3.67	180/ 226	4.10	4.08	4.20	4.17	3.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	66/ 233	4.59	4.50	4.19	4.13	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	2	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	81/ 225	4.67	4.72	4.50	4.45	4.77	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	98/ 223	4.57	4.51	4.35	4.27	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	8	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/ 206	4.72	4.69	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 112	4.17	4.06	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 97	4.00	3.56	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	4.00	3.63	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 105	4.17	4.06	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 98	4.50	3.39	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: PSYC 331 0201  
 Title: EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I  
 Instructor: STAPLETON, LAUR (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 84  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1416  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	12	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	27
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B	11						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	39	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	2						

Course Section: PSYC 331 0201  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 84  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1417  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	12	24	4.62	448/1669	4.60	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	34	4.89	110/1666	4.77	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	6	30	4.78	242/1421	4.68	4.15	4.24	4.25	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	1	5	29	4.80	161/1617	4.67	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	2	6	11	15	4.15	665/1555	4.05	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	2	12	20	4.53	371/1543	4.52	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	5	30	4.76	213/1647	4.57	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	36	5.00	1/1668	4.99	4.77	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	3	0	0	5	8	6	4.05	884/1605	4.10	3.94	4.07	4.09	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	553/1514	4.50	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	973/1551	4.60	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	386/1503	4.39	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	1042/1506	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	8	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	****/1311	4.43	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	3	10	16	4.26	692/1490	4.18	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.26	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	7	23	4.71	450/1502	4.49	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	389/1489	4.44	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	8	2	0	3	3	14	4.23	393/1006	3.91	3.84	4.00	4.10	4.23	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	3	0	2	4	6	3.67	180/ 226	4.10	4.08	4.20	4.17	3.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	66/ 233	4.59	4.50	4.19	4.13	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	2	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	81/ 225	4.67	4.72	4.50	4.45	4.77	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	98/ 223	4.57	4.51	4.35	4.27	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	8	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/ 206	4.72	4.69	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 112	4.17	4.06	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 97	4.00	3.56	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	4.00	3.63	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 105	4.17	4.06	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 98	4.50	3.39	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: PSYC 331 0201  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 84  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1417  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	12	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	27
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B	11						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	39	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	2						

Course Section: PSYC 331 0201  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 84  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1418  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	12	24	4.62	448/1669	4.60	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	34	4.89	110/1666	4.77	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	6	30	4.78	242/1421	4.68	4.15	4.24	4.25	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	1	5	29	4.80	161/1617	4.67	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	2	6	11	15	4.15	665/1555	4.05	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	2	12	20	4.53	371/1543	4.52	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	5	30	4.76	213/1647	4.57	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	36	5.00	1/1668	4.99	4.77	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	713/1605	4.10	3.94	4.07	4.09	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	955/1514	4.50	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	880/1551	4.60	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	0	1	1	1	13	4.63	438/1503	4.39	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	838/1506	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	7	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	****/1311	4.43	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	3	10	16	4.26	692/1490	4.18	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.26	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	7	23	4.71	450/1502	4.49	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	389/1489	4.44	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	8	2	0	3	3	14	4.23	393/1006	3.91	3.84	4.00	4.10	4.23	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	3	0	2	4	6	3.67	180/ 226	4.10	4.08	4.20	4.17	3.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	66/ 233	4.59	4.50	4.19	4.13	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	2	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	81/ 225	4.67	4.72	4.50	4.45	4.77	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	98/ 223	4.57	4.51	4.35	4.27	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	8	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/ 206	4.72	4.69	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 112	4.17	4.06	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 97	4.00	3.56	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	4.00	3.63	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 105	4.17	4.06	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 98	4.50	3.39	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: PSYC 331 0201  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 84  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1418  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	12	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	27
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B	11						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	39	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	2						

Course Section: PSYC 331 0301  
 Title: EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I  
 Instructor: PITTS, STEVEN C (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1419  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	12	0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	489/1669	4.60	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	0	0	2	1	24	4.81	173/1666	4.77	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	0	0	0	2	3	22	4.74	293/1421	4.68	4.15	4.24	4.25	4.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	12	8	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	300/1617	4.67	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	7	0	3	5	5	7	3.80	1021/1555	4.05	4.05	4.00	4.03	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	8	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	325/1543	4.52	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	13	0	0	0	4	5	17	4.50	481/1647	4.57	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	14	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1668	4.99	4.77	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	2	12	12	4.38	525/1605	4.10	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	76/1514	4.50	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1551	4.60	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.37	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	254/1503	4.39	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	2	2	22	4.67	471/1506	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	3	0	1	0	3	20	4.75	142/1311	4.43	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	2	0	2	1	9	4.07	820/1490	4.18	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	632/1502	4.49	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	846/1489	4.44	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	25	7	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	****/1006	3.91	3.84	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	73/ 226	4.10	4.08	4.20	4.17	4.53	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	37/ 233	4.59	4.50	4.19	4.13	4.87	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	5	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	54/ 225	4.67	4.72	4.50	4.45	4.90	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	85/ 223	4.57	4.51	4.35	4.27	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	4	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 206	4.72	4.69	4.15	4.08	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 8	
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C 4	General 2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D 1	Under-grad 39
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 1	Non-major 18
					Electives 1
					#### - Means there are not enough



P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	23	
?	1			

Course Section: PSYC 331 0301  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1420  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	12	0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	489/1669	4.60	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	0	0	2	1	24	4.81	173/1666	4.77	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	0	0	0	2	3	22	4.74	293/1421	4.68	4.15	4.24	4.25	4.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	12	8	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	300/1617	4.67	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	7	0	3	5	5	7	3.80	1021/1555	4.05	4.05	4.00	4.03	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	8	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	325/1543	4.52	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	13	0	0	0	4	5	17	4.50	481/1647	4.57	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	14	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1668	4.99	4.77	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	26	0	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	1255/1605	4.10	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	1	0	2	1	9	4.31	1052/1514	4.50	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	29	0	1	1	0	2	6	4.10	1391/1551	4.60	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.37	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	1	1	0	3	6	4.09	1020/1503	4.39	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	892/1506	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	32	1	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	****/1311	4.43	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	2	0	2	1	9	4.07	820/1490	4.18	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	632/1502	4.49	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	846/1489	4.44	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	25	7	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	****/1006	3.91	3.84	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	73/ 226	4.10	4.08	4.20	4.17	4.53	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	37/ 233	4.59	4.50	4.19	4.13	4.87	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	5	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	54/ 225	4.67	4.72	4.50	4.45	4.90	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	85/ 223	4.57	4.51	4.35	4.27	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	4	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 206	4.72	4.69	4.15	4.08	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 8	
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C 4	General 2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D 1	Under-grad 39
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 1	Non-major 18
					Electives 1
					#### - Means there are not enough

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	23	
?	1			

Course Section: PSYC 331 0301  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1421  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	12	0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	489/1669	4.60	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	0	0	2	1	24	4.81	173/1666	4.77	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	0	0	0	2	3	22	4.74	293/1421	4.68	4.15	4.24	4.25	4.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	12	8	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	300/1617	4.67	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	7	0	3	5	5	7	3.80	1021/1555	4.05	4.05	4.00	4.03	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	8	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	325/1543	4.52	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	13	0	0	0	4	5	17	4.50	481/1647	4.57	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	14	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1668	4.99	4.77	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	26	1	1	0	3	5	3	3.75	1210/1605	4.10	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	2	0	1	4	7	4.00	1199/1514	4.50	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	29	0	2	0	0	2	6	4.00	1404/1551	4.60	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.37	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	2	1	0	4	4	3.64	1289/1503	4.39	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	0	2	0	0	5	4	3.82	1219/1506	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	31	2	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	****/1311	4.43	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	2	0	2	1	9	4.07	820/1490	4.18	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	632/1502	4.49	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	846/1489	4.44	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	25	7	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	****/1006	3.91	3.84	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	73/ 226	4.10	4.08	4.20	4.17	4.53	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	37/ 233	4.59	4.50	4.19	4.13	4.87	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	5	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	54/ 225	4.67	4.72	4.50	4.45	4.90	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	85/ 223	4.57	4.51	4.35	4.27	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	4	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 206	4.72	4.69	4.15	4.08	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 8	
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C 4	General 2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D 1	Under-grad 39
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 1	Non-major 18
					Electives 1
					#### - Means there are not enough

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	23	
?	1			

Course Section: PSYC 331 0301  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I  
 Instructor: (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1422  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	12	0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	489/1669	4.60	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	0	0	2	1	24	4.81	173/1666	4.77	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	0	0	0	2	3	22	4.74	293/1421	4.68	4.15	4.24	4.25	4.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	12	8	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	300/1617	4.67	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	7	0	3	5	5	7	3.80	1021/1555	4.05	4.05	4.00	4.03	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	8	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	325/1543	4.52	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	13	0	0	0	4	5	17	4.50	481/1647	4.57	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	14	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1668	4.99	4.77	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	3	0	0	3	6	0	3.67	****/1605	4.10	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	1199/1514	4.50	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	30	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	****/1551	4.60	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.37	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	31	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	****/1503	4.39	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	****/1506	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	33	2	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1311	4.43	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	2	0	2	1	9	4.07	820/1490	4.18	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	632/1502	4.49	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	846/1489	4.44	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	25	7	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	****/1006	3.91	3.84	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	73/ 226	4.10	4.08	4.20	4.17	4.53	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	37/ 233	4.59	4.50	4.19	4.13	4.87	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	5	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	54/ 225	4.67	4.72	4.50	4.45	4.90	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	85/ 223	4.57	4.51	4.35	4.27	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	4	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 206	4.72	4.69	4.15	4.08	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 21
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C 4	General 2	Under-grad 39	Non-major 18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 1	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	23	
?	1			

Course Section: PSYC 331 8020  
 Title: EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I  
 Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1423  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	2	18	4.81	207/1669	4.60	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	293/1666	4.77	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	429/1421	4.68	4.15	4.24	4.25	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	445/1617	4.67	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	6	13	4.55	301/1555	4.05	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	4	2	13	4.47	427/1543	4.52	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	0	5	13	4.45	583/1647	4.57	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1668	4.99	4.77	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	538/1605	4.10	3.94	4.07	4.09	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	360/1514	4.50	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	650/1551	4.60	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	386/1503	4.39	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	18	4.76	340/1506	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	1	2	16	4.52	255/1311	4.43	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.52	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	433/1490	4.18	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.52	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	729/1502	4.49	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	622/1489	4.44	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	1	3	6	8	4.00	479/1006	3.91	3.84	4.00	4.10	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1	2	0	4	3	5	3.64	182/ 226	4.10	4.08	4.20	4.17	3.64	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	2	1	2	3	7	3.80	178/ 233	4.59	4.50	4.19	4.13	3.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	174/ 225	4.67	4.72	4.50	4.45	4.13	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	2	1	2	10	4.33	138/ 223	4.57	4.51	4.35	4.27	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	2	2	2	2	7	3.67	163/ 206	4.72	4.69	4.15	4.08	3.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	80/ 112	4.17	4.06	4.38	4.53	4.17	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	68/ 97	4.00	3.56	4.36	4.12	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	63/ 92	4.00	3.63	4.22	4.47	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	64/ 105	4.17	4.06	4.20	4.45	4.17	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	28/ 98	4.50	3.39	3.95	4.15	4.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	



Course Section: PSYC 331 8020  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I  
 Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1423  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
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	17				
				?	0						

Course Section: PSYC 332 0101  
 Title: EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: BLASS, THOMAS (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1424  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	9	11	4	3.65	1414/1669	3.37	4.22	4.23	4.28	3.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	10	9	4.00	1094/1666	3.50	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	4	6	6	10	3.85	1095/1421	3.37	4.15	4.24	4.25	3.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	10	12	4.31	750/1617	3.93	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	6	4	6	6	3.24	1364/1555	2.95	4.05	4.00	4.03	3.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	6	10	10	4.15	771/1543	3.84	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	3	6	13	4.00	1043/1647	3.69	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	1	6	17	4.56	1151/1668	4.68	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	8	11	3	3.63	1299/1605	3.03	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	15	6	4.00	1199/1514	3.59	4.35	4.39	4.46	3.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	8	16	4.54	1168/1551	3.94	4.66	4.66	4.70	3.98	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	4	5	13	3	3.50	1330/1503	3.09	4.18	4.24	4.28	3.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	5	6	10	3.69	1265/1506	3.33	4.23	4.26	4.30	3.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	5	4	10	5	3.52	929/1311	3.17	4.08	3.85	3.97	3.52	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	2	8	3	2	2.94	1361/1490	3.05	3.87	4.05	4.11	2.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	4	3	10	4.17	938/1502	3.87	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	1	1	4	10	4.06	1025/1489	3.68	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.06	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	1	0	6	3	1	3.27	865/1006	3.02	3.84	4.00	4.10	3.27	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.72	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.51	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.69	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: PSYC 332 0101  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: BLASS, THOMAS (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1424  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	8
84-150	11	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	24				
				?	0						

Course Section: PSYC 332 0101  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1425  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	9	11	4	3.65	1414/1669	3.37	4.22	4.23	4.28	3.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	10	9	4.00	1094/1666	3.50	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	4	6	6	10	3.85	1095/1421	3.37	4.15	4.24	4.25	3.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	10	12	4.31	750/1617	3.93	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	6	4	6	6	3.24	1364/1555	2.95	4.05	4.00	4.03	3.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	6	10	10	4.15	771/1543	3.84	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	3	6	13	4.00	1043/1647	3.69	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	1	6	17	4.56	1151/1668	4.68	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	1	4	6	1	1	2.77	1542/1605	3.03	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	2	2	4	2	3.36	1413/1514	3.59	4.35	4.39	4.46	3.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	3	1	4	3	3.64	1481/1551	3.94	4.66	4.66	4.70	3.98	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	3	2	3	3	0	2.55	1469/1503	3.09	4.18	4.24	4.28	3.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	1	2	1	4	1	2	3.00	1403/1506	3.33	4.23	4.26	4.30	3.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	3	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	****/1311	3.17	4.08	3.85	3.97	3.52	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	2	8	3	2	2.94	1361/1490	3.05	3.87	4.05	4.11	2.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	4	3	10	4.17	938/1502	3.87	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	1	1	4	10	4.06	1025/1489	3.68	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.06	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	1	0	6	3	1	3.27	865/1006	3.02	3.84	4.00	4.10	3.27	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.72	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.51	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.69	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: PSYC 332 0101  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1425  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	8
84-150	11	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	24				
				?	0						

Course Section: PSYC 332 0101  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1426  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	9	11	4	3.65	1414/1669	3.37	4.22	4.23	4.28	3.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	10	9	4.00	1094/1666	3.50	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	4	6	6	10	3.85	1095/1421	3.37	4.15	4.24	4.25	3.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	10	12	4.31	750/1617	3.93	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	6	4	6	6	3.24	1364/1555	2.95	4.05	4.00	4.03	3.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	6	10	10	4.15	771/1543	3.84	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	3	6	13	4.00	1043/1647	3.69	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	1	6	17	4.56	1151/1668	4.68	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	1	3	6	2	1	2.92	1521/1605	3.03	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	3	3	2	2	3.30	1424/1514	3.59	4.35	4.39	4.46	3.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	1	2	2	2	3	3.40	1501/1551	3.94	4.66	4.66	4.70	3.98	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	3	2	3	0	2	2.60	1463/1503	3.09	4.18	4.24	4.28	3.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	2	5	0	2	3.00	1403/1506	3.33	4.23	4.26	4.30	3.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	1	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	****/1311	3.17	4.08	3.85	3.97	3.52	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	2	8	3	2	2.94	1361/1490	3.05	3.87	4.05	4.11	2.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	4	3	10	4.17	938/1502	3.87	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	1	1	4	10	4.06	1025/1489	3.68	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.06	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	1	0	6	3	1	3.27	865/1006	3.02	3.84	4.00	4.10	3.27	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.72	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.51	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.69	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: PSYC 332 0101  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1426  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	8
84-150	11	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	24				
				?	0						

Course Section: PSYC 332 0101  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1427  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	9	11	4	3.65	1414/1669	3.37	4.22	4.23	4.28	3.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	10	9	4.00	1094/1666	3.50	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	4	6	6	10	3.85	1095/1421	3.37	4.15	4.24	4.25	3.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	10	12	4.31	750/1617	3.93	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	6	4	6	6	3.24	1364/1555	2.95	4.05	4.00	4.03	3.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	6	10	10	4.15	771/1543	3.84	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	3	6	13	4.00	1043/1647	3.69	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	1	6	17	4.56	1151/1668	4.68	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	2	5	5	0	3.25	1455/1605	3.03	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1166/1514	3.59	4.35	4.39	4.46	3.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1304/1551	3.94	4.66	4.66	4.70	3.98	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	1301/1503	3.09	4.18	4.24	4.28	3.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1174/1506	3.33	4.23	4.26	4.30	3.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	3	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1311	3.17	4.08	3.85	3.97	3.52	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	2	8	3	2	2.94	1361/1490	3.05	3.87	4.05	4.11	2.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	4	3	10	4.17	938/1502	3.87	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	1	1	4	10	4.06	1025/1489	3.68	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.06	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	1	0	6	3	1	3.27	865/1006	3.02	3.84	4.00	4.10	3.27	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.72	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.51	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.69	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	



Course Section: PSYC 332 0101  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1427  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	8
84-150	11	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	24				
				?	0						

Course Section: PSYC 332 0201  
 Title: EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: GRONINGER, LOWE (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1428  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	2	6	8	4	3	3.00	1596/1669	3.37	4.22	4.23	4.28	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5	5	5	4	4	2.87	1598/1666	3.50	4.13	4.19	4.20	2.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	9	3	4	2	2.52	1405/1421	3.37	4.15	4.24	4.25	2.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	1	5	10	3	3.30	1459/1617	3.93	4.15	4.15	4.22	3.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	8	3	3	7	2	2.65	1506/1555	2.95	4.05	4.00	4.03	2.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	5	2	10	3	3.32	1328/1543	3.84	4.00	4.06	4.14	3.32	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	3	4	8	5	3.39	1444/1647	3.69	4.15	4.12	4.14	3.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	357/1668	4.68	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	4	4	5	5	0	2.61	1554/1605	3.03	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	3	2	6	5	6	3.41	1407/1514	3.59	4.35	4.39	4.46	3.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	2	7	5	7	3.68	1475/1551	3.94	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.03	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	7	2	7	3	3	2.68	1457/1503	3.09	4.18	4.24	4.28	3.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	6	3	5	5	3	2.82	1430/1506	3.33	4.23	4.26	4.30	3.66	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	2	4	4	4	5	3.32	1037/1311	3.17	4.08	3.85	3.97	3.32	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	4	3	5	3	3.06	1322/1490	3.05	3.87	4.05	4.11	3.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	3	4	7	3	3.44	1323/1502	3.87	4.18	4.26	4.28	3.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	3	5	5	3	3.22	1367/1489	3.68	4.22	4.29	4.35	3.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	12	2	0	3	1	0	2.50	967/1006	3.02	3.84	4.00	4.10	2.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.72	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 223	****	4.51	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 206	****	4.69	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				



Course Section: PSYC 332 0201  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1429  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	2	6	8	4	3	3.00	1596/1669	3.37	4.22	4.23	4.28	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5	5	5	4	4	2.87	1598/1666	3.50	4.13	4.19	4.20	2.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	9	3	4	2	2.52	1405/1421	3.37	4.15	4.24	4.25	2.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	1	5	10	3	3.30	1459/1617	3.93	4.15	4.15	4.22	3.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	8	3	3	7	2	2.65	1506/1555	2.95	4.05	4.00	4.03	2.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	5	2	10	3	3.32	1328/1543	3.84	4.00	4.06	4.14	3.32	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	3	4	8	5	3.39	1444/1647	3.69	4.15	4.12	4.14	3.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	357/1668	4.68	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1378/1605	3.03	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1166/1514	3.59	4.35	4.39	4.46	3.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1284/1551	3.94	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.03	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	996/1503	3.09	4.18	4.24	4.28	3.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	642/1506	3.33	4.23	4.26	4.30	3.66	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	4	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1311	3.17	4.08	3.85	3.97	3.32	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	4	3	5	3	3.06	1322/1490	3.05	3.87	4.05	4.11	3.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	3	4	7	3	3.44	1323/1502	3.87	4.18	4.26	4.28	3.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	3	5	5	3	3.22	1367/1489	3.68	4.22	4.29	4.35	3.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	12	2	0	3	1	0	2.50	967/1006	3.02	3.84	4.00	4.10	2.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.72	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 223	****	4.51	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 206	****	4.69	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	

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	1	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	17

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



Course Section: PSYC 332 0301  
 Title: EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: FREUND, LISA  
 Enrollment: 48  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1430  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	13	0	4	8	9	8	4	3.00	1596/1669	3.37	4.22	4.23	4.28	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	13	0	5	10	11	3	4	2.73	1618/1666	3.50	4.13	4.19	4.20	2.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	13	2	3	4	14	5	5	3.16	1332/1421	3.37	4.15	4.24	4.25	3.16	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	13	0	2	2	11	7	11	3.70	1284/1617	3.93	4.15	4.15	4.22	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	13	4	11	5	7	2	4	2.41	1531/1555	2.95	4.05	4.00	4.03	2.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	1	2	3	9	9	9	3.63	1215/1543	3.84	4.00	4.06	4.14	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	13	0	4	7	9	9	4	3.06	1523/1647	3.69	4.15	4.12	4.14	3.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	13	0	0	0	0	13	20	4.61	1125/1668	4.68	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	5	9	11	2	2	2.55	1558/1605	3.03	3.94	4.07	4.09	2.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	7	9	4	8	5	2.85	1477/1514	3.59	4.35	4.39	4.46	2.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	2	5	5	13	8	3.61	1485/1551	3.94	4.66	4.66	4.70	3.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	7	10	8	7	1	2.55	1469/1503	3.09	4.18	4.24	4.28	2.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	9	10	7	6	1	2.39	1470/1506	3.33	4.23	4.26	4.30	2.39	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	3	7	5	9	4	3	2.68	1207/1311	3.17	4.08	3.85	3.97	2.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	3	5	3	5	3.47	1172/1490	3.05	3.87	4.05	4.11	3.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	2	2	3	5	5	3.53	1296/1502	3.87	4.18	4.26	4.28	3.53	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	3	2	7	0	5	3.12	1390/1489	3.68	4.22	4.29	4.35	3.12	
4. Were special techniques successful	29	7	0	2	3	3	2	3.50	****/1006	3.02	3.84	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	3	0	1	5	3.89	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	2	1	0	6	4.11	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	36	2	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	****/ 225	****	4.72	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	****/ 223	****	4.51	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	1	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	****/ 206	****	4.69	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	44	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	44	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	44	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: PSYC 332 0301  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: FREUND, LISA  
 Enrollment: 48  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1430  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	46	Non-major	23
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	0						

Course Section: PSYC 335 0101  
 Title: PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLO  
 Instructor: PROVINE, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 120  
 Questionnaires: 113

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1431  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	42	0	1	7	13	20	30	4.00	1173/1669	3.97	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	43	0	5	7	14	23	21	3.69	1372/1666	3.76	4.13	4.19	4.20	3.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	42	0	4	8	14	26	19	3.68	1163/1421	3.69	4.15	4.24	4.25	3.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	42	5	10	11	21	11	13	3.09	1501/1617	3.29	4.15	4.15	4.22	3.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	42	1	1	5	14	23	27	4.00	773/1555	4.15	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	42	5	12	12	19	9	14	3.02	1408/1543	3.11	4.00	4.06	4.14	3.02	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	42	0	2	3	7	15	44	4.35	728/1647	4.46	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	42	0	1	0	0	46	24	4.30	1358/1668	4.45	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.30	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	48	2	6	7	14	24	12	3.46	1374/1605	3.54	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	42	0	2	10	14	18	27	3.82	1303/1514	4.18	4.35	4.39	4.46	3.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	41	0	0	4	5	14	49	4.50	1193/1551	4.44	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	42	0	7	11	11	22	20	3.52	1324/1503	3.70	4.18	4.24	4.28	3.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	42	0	7	5	11	14	34	3.89	1184/1506	3.73	4.23	4.26	4.30	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	42	41	9	6	4	6	5	2.73	1199/1311	3.34	4.08	3.85	3.97	2.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	70	0	10	10	5	9	9	2.93	1366/1490	2.76	3.87	4.05	4.11	2.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	71	0	7	8	3	9	15	3.40	1338/1502	3.05	4.18	4.26	4.28	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	71	0	6	7	6	10	13	3.40	1318/1489	3.32	4.22	4.29	4.35	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	70	38	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	112	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	112	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	110	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	4.72	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	112	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 223	****	4.51	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	112	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 206	****	4.69	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	112	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	112	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	112	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	112	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	112	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	112	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	111	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	112	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	112	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	112	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	112	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	111	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	112	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	



Course Section: PSYC 335 0101  
 Title: PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLO  
 Instructor: PROVINE, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 120  
 Questionnaires: 113

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1431  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	15	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	50
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	13	2.00-2.99	16	C	20	General	9	Under-grad	113	Non-major	63
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	11	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	47				
				?	2						

Course Section: PSYC 335 0201  
 Title: PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLO  
 Instructor: WARWICK, ZOE  
 Enrollment: 128  
 Questionnaires: 76

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1432  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	7	19	22	28	3.93	1253/1669	3.97	4.22	4.23	4.28	3.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	21	27	22	3.84	1280/1666	3.76	4.13	4.19	4.20	3.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	7	21	22	22	3.71	1152/1421	3.69	4.15	4.24	4.25	3.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	7	11	16	11	24	3.49	1377/1617	3.29	4.15	4.15	4.22	3.49	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	4	9	19	38	4.30	516/1555	4.15	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	10	9	24	12	16	3.21	1355/1543	3.11	4.00	4.06	4.14	3.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	7	12	54	4.57	401/1647	4.46	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	6	0	0	0	27	42	4.61	1125/1668	4.45	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	0	3	26	27	8	3.63	1299/1605	3.54	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	6	22	45	4.53	763/1514	4.18	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	11	17	43	4.38	1279/1551	4.44	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	2	22	19	26	3.88	1180/1503	3.70	4.18	4.24	4.28	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	3	9	10	9	16	26	3.57	1305/1506	3.73	4.23	4.26	4.30	3.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	4	4	13	18	30	3.96	643/1311	3.34	4.08	3.85	3.97	3.96	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	45	0	11	3	10	2	5	2.58	1424/1490	2.76	3.87	4.05	4.11	2.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	11	4	8	4	6	2.70	1461/1502	3.05	4.18	4.26	4.28	2.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	46	0	4	4	10	5	7	3.23	1365/1489	3.32	4.22	4.29	4.35	3.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	45	25	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	74	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.13	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	74	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	75	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	74	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	75	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	75	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	75	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 1	A 20	Required for Majors	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 22		
56-83	13	2.00-2.99 12	C 17	General	4
84-150	21	3.00-3.49 17	D 1	Under-grad	76
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 1		
			P 0	### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0		
			? 4	Other	53
					44

Course Section: PSYC 340 0101  
 Title SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: BLASS, THOMAS  
 Enrollment: 65  
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1433  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	3	0	0	1	7	20	14	4.12	1090/1669	4.43	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.12	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	2	15	13	12	3.83	1288/1666	4.04	4.13	4.19	4.20	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	4	8	14	16	4.00	969/1421	3.94	4.15	4.24	4.25	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	3	1	3	7	12	16	4.00	1029/1617	4.13	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	5	10	23	4.27	550/1555	4.49	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	4	9	17	10	3.83	1084/1543	4.04	4.00	4.06	4.14	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	2	5	5	6	23	4.05	1022/1647	4.27	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	1	0	0	20	20	4.41	1265/1668	4.64	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.41	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	4	13	11	4	3.47	1374/1605	3.65	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	5	9	27	4.48	845/1514	4.55	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	0	12	28	4.57	1135/1551	4.60	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	6	7	17	12	3.83	1197/1503	4.17	4.18	4.24	4.28	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	3	15	22	4.31	868/1506	4.47	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	0	1	7	12	17	4.22	470/1311	4.36	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	3	5	8	8	3	3.11	1314/1490	3.77	3.87	4.05	4.11	3.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	4	6	8	6	2	2.85	1433/1502	3.42	4.18	4.26	4.28	2.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	4	4	7	6	6	3.22	1367/1489	3.83	4.22	4.29	4.35	3.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	12	4	5	1	5	0	2.47	976/1006	3.48	3.84	4.00	4.10	2.47	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 2	A 9	Required for Majors	3
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 1	B 18		Graduate 0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 5	C 13	General	5
84-150	12	3.00-3.49 13	D 0		Under-grad 45
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives	4
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	30
			? 1		

Course Section: PSYC 340 8020  
 Title SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: ARTEAGA, SHIRLE  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1434  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	269/1669	4.43	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	881/1666	4.04	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1078/1421	3.94	4.15	4.24	4.25	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	801/1617	4.13	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	195/1555	4.49	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	659/1543	4.04	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	481/1647	4.27	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	769/1668	4.64	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1148/1605	3.65	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	647/1514	4.55	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1083/1551	4.60	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	556/1503	4.17	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	521/1506	4.47	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	264/1311	4.36	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	535/1490	3.77	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1013/1502	3.42	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	776/1489	3.83	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	235/1006	3.48	3.84	4.00	4.10	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PSYC 345 0101  
 Title INTRO CLINICAL PSYCH  
 Instructor: DELUTY, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1435  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	8	18	4.63	448/1669	4.63	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	7	19	4.67	359/1666	4.67	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	6	19	4.69	356/1421	4.69	4.15	4.24	4.25	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	11	3	2	3	3	4	3.20	1487/1617	3.20	4.15	4.15	4.22	3.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	7	18	4.52	332/1555	4.52	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	5	3	5	3	3	2.79	1484/1543	2.79	4.00	4.06	4.14	2.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	302/1647	4.67	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	285/1668	4.96	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	12	15	4.56	335/1605	4.56	3.94	4.07	4.09	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	223/1514	4.89	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	409/1551	4.93	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	8	19	4.70	335/1503	4.70	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	21	4.78	326/1506	4.78	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	1	1	9	12	4.39	341/1311	4.39	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	8	10	8	3.89	965/1490	3.89	3.87	4.05	4.11	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	1	7	18	4.52	622/1502	4.52	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.52	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	3	7	16	4.41	800/1489	4.41	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.41	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	24	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	4.10	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 17		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 4	C 3	General	12
84-150	14	3.00-3.49 10	D 0	Under-grad	29
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	10
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course Section: PSYC 356 8020  
 Title PSYC OF SEX DIFFERENCE  
 Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1436  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	8	4.64	433/1669	4.64	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	399/1666	4.64	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	719/1421	4.36	4.15	4.24	4.25	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	684/1617	4.36	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1087/1555	3.73	4.05	4.00	4.03	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	838/1543	4.09	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	713/1647	4.36	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	713/1668	4.90	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	538/1605	4.38	3.94	4.07	4.09	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	489/1514	4.73	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	512/1551	4.91	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.18	4.24	4.28	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	164/1506	4.90	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	158/1311	4.73	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	289/1490	4.73	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	866/1502	4.27	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	564/1489	4.64	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	694/1006	3.67	3.84	4.00	4.10	3.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PSYC 357 0101  
 Title PSYC OF WOMEN  
 Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1437  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	9	0	1	0	0	5	24	4.70	345/1669	4.70	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	1	1	0	7	21	4.53	516/1666	4.53	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	2	1	5	22	4.57	502/1421	4.57	4.15	4.24	4.25	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	1	0	0	2	8	19	4.59	414/1617	4.59	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	5	7	17	4.30	516/1555	4.30	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	12	1	0	2	4	11	4.33	580/1543	4.33	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	0	0	0	2	9	18	4.55	424/1647	4.55	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	1	0	9	18	4.57	320/1605	4.57	3.94	4.07	4.09	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.35	4.39	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.66	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	51/1503	4.96	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.96	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.23	4.26	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	0	1	0	1	3	23	4.68	184/1311	4.68	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	206/1490	4.81	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.81	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	326/1502	4.81	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	309/1489	4.88	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	3	3	0	3	2	5	3.46	779/1006	3.46	3.84	4.00	4.10	3.46	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 23	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 6	C 0	General 13	Under-grad 39 Non-major 23
84-150	15	3.00-3.49 12	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 8	
			? 0		

Course Section: PSYC 360 0101  
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF MOTIVATI  
 Instructor: RABIN, BERNARD  
 Enrollment: 65  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1438  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	6	0	2	3	10	10	4	3.38	1532/1669	3.38	4.22	4.23	4.28	3.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	1	4	5	12	7	3.69	1372/1666	3.69	4.13	4.19	4.20	3.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	1	3	7	6	11	3.82	1106/1421	3.82	4.15	4.24	4.25	3.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	23	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/1617	****	4.15	4.15	4.22	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	1	4	2	10	8	3	3.15	1401/1555	3.15	4.05	4.00	4.03	3.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	26	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1543	****	4.00	4.06	4.14	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	1	1	3	5	18	4.36	728/1647	4.36	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	1	11	8	8	3.82	1604/1668	3.82	4.77	4.67	4.68	3.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	1	3	9	6	2	3.24	1461/1605	3.24	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	392/1514	4.79	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	3	9	16	4.46	1223/1551	4.46	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	1	5	9	11	4.04	1050/1503	4.04	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	6	9	12	4.11	1025/1506	4.11	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	3	3	2	2	7	11	3.84	738/1311	3.84	4.08	3.85	3.97	3.84	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	3	1	3	1	4	3.17	1299/1490	3.17	3.87	4.05	4.11	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	3	0	7	1	1	2.75	1450/1502	2.75	4.18	4.26	4.28	2.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	1	3	4	3	1	3.00	1398/1489	3.00	4.22	4.29	4.35	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	11	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 7	C 10	General	6
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 11	D 0		Under-grad 35
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	0
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	20
			? 3		



Course Section: PSYC 370 0101  
 Title SENSATION AND PERCEPTI  
 Instructor: PROVINE, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 144  
 Questionnaires: 136

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1439  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	56	0	4	5	11	21	39	4.07	1124/1669	4.17	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	57	0	5	11	15	22	26	3.67	1380/1666	4.10	4.13	4.19	4.20	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	56	0	5	7	17	24	27	3.76	1131/1421	3.87	4.15	4.24	4.25	3.76	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	56	11	9	10	16	21	13	3.28	1467/1617	3.84	4.15	4.15	4.22	3.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	57	2	3	8	10	34	22	3.83	996/1555	3.97	4.05	4.00	4.03	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	56	5	19	11	18	17	10	2.84	1474/1543	3.64	4.00	4.06	4.14	2.84	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	57	0	3	5	8	17	46	4.24	873/1647	4.43	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	56	0	0	0	0	65	15	4.19	1425/1668	4.59	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	67	2	4	6	14	28	15	3.66	1280/1605	4.00	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	57	0	3	7	18	19	32	3.89	1277/1514	4.30	4.35	4.39	4.46	3.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	57	0	2	1	6	12	58	4.56	1152/1551	4.63	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	57	0	5	8	17	27	22	3.67	1273/1503	4.09	4.18	4.24	4.28	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	59	0	3	10	8	23	33	3.95	1132/1506	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.30	3.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	57	40	10	7	9	7	6	2.79	1187/1311	3.74	4.08	3.85	3.97	2.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	87	0	8	5	10	15	11	3.33	1236/1490	3.75	3.87	4.05	4.11	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	87	0	4	3	10	9	23	3.90	1123/1502	4.10	4.18	4.26	4.28	3.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	87	0	6	2	12	18	11	3.53	1266/1489	4.02	4.22	4.29	4.35	3.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	87	45	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/1006	4.42	3.84	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	127	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	134	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	132	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.72	4.50	4.45	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	131	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	134	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.45	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	134	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	134	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	133	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 20	Required for Majors	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 40		Graduate 0
56-83	11	2.00-2.99 12	C 16	General	6
84-150	26	3.00-3.49 18	D 0		Under-grad 136
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 21	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	66
			? 0		

Course Section: PSYC 370 8020  
 Title SENSATION AND PERCEPTI  
 Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1440  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	6	10	17	4.26	901/1669	4.17	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	8	23	4.53	527/1666	4.10	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	8	12	12	3.97	996/1421	3.87	4.15	4.24	4.25	3.97	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	1	7	21	4.41	641/1617	3.84	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	8	5	18	4.12	698/1555	3.97	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	3	5	20	4.43	478/1543	3.64	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	26	4.62	356/1647	4.43	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1668	4.59	4.77	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	10	15	4.34	578/1605	4.00	3.94	4.07	4.09	4.34	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	27	4.71	522/1514	4.30	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	4	26	4.70	986/1551	4.63	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	5	22	4.50	556/1503	4.09	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	4	25	4.58	575/1506	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	2	3	25	4.68	184/1311	3.74	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	5	7	19	4.18	756/1490	3.75	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.18	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	2	4	6	21	4.29	852/1502	4.10	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	2	1	5	25	4.50	684/1489	4.02	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	10	0	1	4	3	16	4.42	299/1006	4.42	3.84	4.00	4.10	4.42	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.72	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.51	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.69	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	

Course Section: PSYC 370 8020  
 Title SENSATION AND PERCEPTI  
 Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1440  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	8	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	32
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	9	General	5	Under-grad	34	Non-major	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	0						

Course Section: PSYC 380 0101  
 Title PERSONALITY  
 Instructor: PARKER, LESLIE  
 Enrollment: 56  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1441  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	5	19	17	4.19	1001/1669	4.19	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	7	18	14	3.93	1192/1666	3.93	4.13	4.19	4.20	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	8	18	13	3.91	1061/1421	3.91	4.15	4.24	4.25	3.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	39	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1617	****	4.15	4.15	4.22	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	3	8	11	17	3.79	1029/1555	3.79	4.05	4.00	4.03	3.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	39	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1543	****	4.00	4.06	4.14	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	1	1	4	35	4.69	270/1647	4.69	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	38	5	4.12	1470/1668	4.12	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.12	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	6	18	13	4.19	769/1605	4.19	3.94	4.07	4.09	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	4	10	27	4.48	845/1514	4.48	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	38	4.88	567/1551	4.88	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	4	16	18	4.25	879/1503	4.25	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	2	9	28	4.48	680/1506	4.48	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	2	4	3	11	9	3.72	807/1311	3.72	4.08	3.85	3.97	3.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	6	2	3	5	4	2.95	1355/1490	2.95	3.87	4.05	4.11	2.95	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	3	1	3	5	9	3.76	1202/1502	3.76	4.18	4.26	4.28	3.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	1	1	1	7	11	4.24	930/1489	4.24	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.24	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	30
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	25						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	6	Under-grad	44	Non-major	14
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	14	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	29				
				?	1						

Course Section: PSYC 385 0201  
 Title HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER  
 Enrollment: 53  
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1442  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	17	0	0	0	0	3	31	4.91	115/1669	4.91	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	15	0	0	0	2	5	29	4.75	243/1666	4.75	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	17	0	0	0	1	5	28	4.79	229/1421	4.79	4.15	4.24	4.25	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	17	2	0	0	8	5	19	4.34	706/1617	4.34	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.34	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	1	8	24	4.59	277/1555	4.59	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	3	12	18	4.38	534/1543	4.38	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	17	0	3	3	4	8	16	3.91	1149/1647	3.91	4.15	4.12	4.14	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	17	0	0	0	0	3	31	4.91	641/1668	4.91	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	0	0	1	7	26	4.74	182/1605	4.74	3.94	4.07	4.09	4.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	1	1	31	4.91	189/1514	4.91	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.66	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	0	0	0	4	28	4.88	154/1503	4.88	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	2	29	4.88	200/1506	4.88	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	12	1	1	3	6	10	4.10	542/1311	4.10	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	433/1490	4.52	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.52	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	1	0	1	20	4.82	326/1502	4.82	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	280/1489	4.90	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	31	13	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.53	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	17
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	13
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	0
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	15	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1
				Required for Majors	3
				General	14
				Electives	0
				Other	14
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course Section: PSYC 387 0101  
 Title: COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: BRODSKY, ANNE  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1443  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	14	0	0	1	3	7	15	4.38	757/1669	4.38	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	14	0	0	0	5	9	12	4.27	868/1666	4.27	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	14	0	0	2	2	10	12	4.23	831/1421	4.23	4.15	4.24	4.25	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	14	0	0	1	3	11	11	4.23	821/1617	4.23	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	11	13	4.42	418/1555	4.42	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	5	9	11	4.15	771/1543	4.15	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	14	0	0	2	2	10	12	4.23	885/1647	4.23	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	14	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	1	3	12	10	4.19	759/1605	4.19	3.94	4.07	4.09	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	1	1	5	19	4.62	663/1514	4.62	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	567/1551	4.88	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	323/1503	4.72	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	534/1506	4.62	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	1	1	2	3	6	12	4.08	547/1311	4.08	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	604/1490	4.35	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.35	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	3	1	13	4.59	558/1502	4.59	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.59	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	553/1489	4.65	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.65	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	0	1	1	7	3	5	3.59	735/1006	3.59	3.84	4.00	4.10	3.59	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	11	Under-grad	40	Non-major	25
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course Section: PSYC 390 0101  
 Title NEUROPSYCHOPHARMACOLOGY  
 Instructor: RABIN, BERNARD  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1444  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	7	10	4.37	781/1669	4.37	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	7	6	3.94	1178/1666	3.94	4.13	4.19	4.20	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	6	9	4.05	950/1421	4.05	4.15	4.24	4.25	4.05	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1617	****	4.15	4.15	4.22	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	3	10	4.17	644/1555	4.17	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	345/1647	4.63	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	1157/1668	4.56	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	2	4	7	3	3.69	1261/1605	3.69	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	553/1514	4.68	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	1097/1551	4.61	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	4	9	4.11	1005/1503	4.11	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	892/1506	4.28	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	264/1311	4.50	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	3.87	4.05	4.11	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	2	1	0	1	2.60	1467/1502	2.60	4.18	4.26	4.28	2.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1398/1489	3.00	4.22	4.29	4.35	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.13	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	5	Under-grad	19	Non-major	13
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	5	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	8				
				?	0						

Course Section: PSYC 636 0101  
 Title Primary Prevention  
 Instructor: Brown, Lewis  
 Enrollment: 0  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 3  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1052/1669	****	4.14	4.23	4.02	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	3.86	1273/1666	****	3.93	4.19	4.11	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1421	****	4.00	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	3.86	1196/1617	****	4.02	4.15	3.99	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	492/1555	****	4.12	4.00	3.92	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1076/1543	****	3.98	4.06	3.86	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	651/1647	****	3.81	4.12	4.06	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1668	****	4.72	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	3.43	1391/1605	****	3.90	4.07	3.96	3.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1295/1514	****	4.30	4.39	4.32	3.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1135/1551	****	4.63	4.66	4.55	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	2	0	3.29	1389/1503	****	4.15	4.24	4.17	3.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	2	0	2.86	1426/1506	****	4.07	4.26	4.17	2.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1311	****	4.14	3.85	3.68	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	778/1490	****	4.11	4.05	3.85	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	438/1502	****	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	532/1489	****	4.23	4.29	4.07	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	479/1006	****	4.20	4.00	3.81	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.53	4.38	4.04	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.17	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	3.80	3.95	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

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



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	151/1669	****	4.14	4.23	4.02	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	243/1666	****	3.93	4.19	4.11	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	****	4.00	4.24	4.11	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	370/1617	****	4.02	4.15	3.99	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	996/1555	****	4.12	4.00	3.92	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	390/1543	****	3.98	4.06	3.86	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	213/1647	****	3.81	4.12	4.06	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	965/1668	****	4.72	4.67	4.62	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	538/1605	****	3.90	4.07	3.96	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	274/1514	****	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	****	4.63	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1503	****	4.15	4.24	4.17	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1506	****	4.07	4.26	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	333/1311	****	4.14	3.85	3.68	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	****	4.11	4.05	3.85	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	****	4.32	4.26	4.06	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	****	4.23	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	4.20	4.00	3.81	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.70	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.53	4.06	3.81	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	2.40	3.97	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PSYC 400 0101  
 Title SEM IN DEVELOPMENTL PS  
 Instructor: SONNENSCHNEIN, S  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1445  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	5	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	676/1669	4.44	4.22	4.23	4.39	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1250/1666	3.89	4.13	4.19	4.22	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	4	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.15	4.24	4.38	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	301/1555	4.56	4.05	4.00	4.08	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	250/1543	4.67	4.00	4.06	4.18	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	583/1647	4.44	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	750/1668	4.89	4.77	4.67	4.70	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	5	3	1	3.56	1334/1605	3.56	3.94	4.07	4.16	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	223/1514	4.89	4.35	4.39	4.45	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1028/1551	4.67	4.66	4.66	4.73	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1005/1503	4.11	4.18	4.24	4.27	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1017/1506	4.11	4.23	4.26	4.29	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	264/1311	4.50	4.08	3.85	3.88	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	778/1490	4.14	3.87	4.05	4.26	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	438/1502	4.71	4.18	4.26	4.46	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	1209/1489	3.71	4.22	4.29	4.52	3.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	4.21	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	3.86	****	

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 6		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	9

Course Section: PSYC 406 0101  
 Title ADV BEHAVIOR PATHOLOGY  
 Instructor: MURPHY, CHRISTO  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1446  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	4	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	633/1669	4.48	4.22	4.23	4.39	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	10	10	4.43	662/1666	4.43	4.13	4.19	4.22	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	9	11	4.48	594/1421	4.48	4.15	4.24	4.38	4.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	4	0	0	4	7	5	4.06	993/1617	4.06	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	255/1555	4.62	4.05	4.00	4.08	4.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	7	6	5	3.74	1152/1543	3.74	4.00	4.06	4.18	3.74	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	458/1647	4.52	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	12	9	4.43	1257/1668	4.43	4.77	4.67	4.70	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	1	9	8	4.26	678/1605	4.26	3.94	4.07	4.16	4.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	974/1514	4.38	4.35	4.39	4.45	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	512/1551	4.90	4.66	4.66	4.73	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	653/1503	4.45	4.18	4.24	4.27	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	4	15	4.65	484/1506	4.65	4.23	4.26	4.29	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	2	2	6	8	4.11	531/1311	4.11	4.08	3.85	3.88	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	816/1490	4.08	3.87	4.05	4.26	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.18	4.26	4.46	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	973/1489	4.17	4.22	4.29	4.52	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	11	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	6
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	D 0		25
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 1		

Course Section: PSYC 407 8020  
 Title ADV CHILD PSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, ROBY  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1447  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	2	17	4.89	135/1669	4.89	4.22	4.23	4.39	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	110/1666	4.89	4.13	4.19	4.22	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	280/1421	4.75	4.15	4.24	4.38	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	146/1617	4.83	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	14	4.58	285/1555	4.58	4.05	4.00	4.08	4.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	195/1543	4.74	4.00	4.06	4.18	4.74	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	67/1647	4.95	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	1177/1668	4.53	4.77	4.67	4.70	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	239/1605	4.67	3.94	4.07	4.16	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	473/1514	4.74	4.35	4.39	4.45	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	307/1551	4.95	4.66	4.66	4.73	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	182/1503	4.84	4.18	4.24	4.27	4.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	98/1506	4.94	4.23	4.26	4.29	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	214/1311	4.61	4.08	3.85	3.88	4.61	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	289/1490	4.72	3.87	4.05	4.26	4.72	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	370/1502	4.78	4.18	4.26	4.46	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	299/1489	4.89	4.22	4.29	4.52	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	185/1006	4.65	3.84	4.00	4.21	4.65	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 13	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	9
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 1		

Course Section: PSYC 409 0101  
 Title DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCAT  
 Instructor: SONNENSCHNEIN, S  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1448  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	0	8	8	4.17	1026/1669	4.17	4.22	4.23	4.39	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	8	4.11	1028/1666	4.11	4.13	4.19	4.22	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	10	5	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.15	4.24	4.38	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	8	4.11	958/1617	4.11	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	3	10	4.17	644/1555	4.17	4.05	4.00	4.08	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	7	5	3.83	1076/1543	3.83	4.00	4.06	4.18	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	682/1647	4.39	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	4	4.22	1400/1668	4.22	4.77	4.67	4.70	4.22	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	5	9	2	3.65	1286/1605	3.65	3.94	4.07	4.16	3.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	6	11	4.44	892/1514	4.44	4.35	4.39	4.45	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	2	15	4.67	1028/1551	4.67	4.66	4.66	4.73	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	10	5	3.94	1127/1503	3.94	4.18	4.24	4.27	3.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	3	11	4.28	892/1506	4.28	4.23	4.26	4.29	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	1	6	3	3	3.43	983/1311	3.43	4.08	3.85	3.88	3.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	232/1490	4.79	3.87	4.05	4.26	4.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	286/1502	4.86	4.18	4.26	4.46	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	622/1489	4.57	4.22	4.29	4.52	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	430/1006	4.15	3.84	4.00	4.21	4.15	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course Section: PSYC 415 0101  
 Title SEM IN COGNITIVE PSYC  
 Instructor: GRONINGER, LOWE  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1449  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1/1669	5.00	4.22	4.23	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	777/1666	4.33	4.13	4.19	4.22	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.15	4.24	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.15	4.15	4.22	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1555	5.00	4.05	4.00	4.08	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	250/1543	4.67	4.00	4.06	4.18	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	759/1647	4.33	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	239/1605	4.67	3.94	4.07	4.16	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.35	4.39	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.66	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	386/1503	4.67	4.18	4.24	4.27	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.23	4.26	4.29	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1311	5.00	4.08	3.85	3.88	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1490	4.50	3.87	4.05	4.26	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.18	4.26	4.46	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.22	4.29	4.52	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 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 2
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 1		

Course Section: PSYC 480 8020  
 Title SEMINAR IN PERSONALITY  
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1450  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	2	5	4.71	318/1669	4.71	4.22	4.23	4.39	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	293/1666	4.71	4.13	4.19	4.22	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.15	4.24	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	219/1617	4.75	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	285/1555	4.57	4.05	4.00	4.08	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	783/1543	4.14	4.00	4.06	4.18	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1250/1647	3.80	4.15	4.12	4.14	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.00	4.77	4.67	4.70	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	194/1605	4.71	3.94	4.07	4.16	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	505/1514	4.71	4.35	4.39	4.45	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.66	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	323/1503	4.71	4.18	4.24	4.27	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	225/1506	4.86	4.23	4.26	4.29	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	587/1311	4.00	4.08	3.85	3.88	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	177/1490	4.86	3.87	4.05	4.26	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.18	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.22	4.29	4.52	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	199/1006	4.60	3.84	4.00	4.21	4.60	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	3.86	****	

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 2		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 8
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		

Course Section: PSYC 493A 0101  
 Title ADV.PSYC.TPCS: PNI  
 Instructor: MCGUIRE, LYNNAN  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1451  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	7	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	151/1669	4.88	4.22	4.23	4.39	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	243/1666	4.75	4.13	4.19	4.22	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.15	4.24	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	1	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	161/1617	4.80	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	249/1555	4.63	4.05	4.00	4.08	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	298/1543	4.60	4.00	4.06	4.18	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	161/1647	4.81	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	111/1605	4.88	3.94	4.07	4.16	4.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.35	4.39	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.66	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	210/1503	4.81	4.18	4.24	4.27	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	353/1506	4.75	4.23	4.26	4.29	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	291/1311	4.47	4.08	3.85	3.88	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	622/1490	4.33	3.87	4.05	4.26	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	336/1502	4.80	4.18	4.26	4.46	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	378/1489	4.80	4.22	4.29	4.52	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	167/1006	4.69	3.84	4.00	4.21	4.69	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	23	Non-major	12
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	4	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	11				
				?	0						



Course Section: PSYC 493B 0101  
 Title ADV.PSYC.TPCS:SOC/HEAL  
 Instructor: BEDIAKO, SHAWN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1452  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	77/1669	4.94	4.22	4.23	4.39	4.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	715/1666	4.39	4.13	4.19	4.22	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	14	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1421	****	4.15	4.24	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	277/1617	4.71	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	255/1555	4.61	4.05	4.00	4.08	4.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	164/1543	4.78	4.00	4.06	4.18	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	1	12	4.33	759/1647	4.33	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	10	8	4.44	1240/1668	4.44	4.77	4.67	4.70	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	373/1605	4.50	3.94	4.07	4.16	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	489/1514	4.72	4.35	4.39	4.45	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.66	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.18	4.24	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	98/1506	4.94	4.23	4.26	4.29	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1311	****	4.08	3.85	3.88	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1490	5.00	3.87	4.05	4.26	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	306/1502	4.83	4.18	4.26	4.46	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	168/1489	4.94	4.22	4.29	4.52	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	9	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	617/1006	3.88	3.84	4.00	4.21	3.88	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	29/ 112	4.93	4.06	4.38	4.74	4.93	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	1	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	46/ 97	4.62	3.56	4.36	4.69	4.62	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	39/ 92	4.62	3.63	4.22	4.48	4.62	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	24/ 105	4.93	4.06	4.20	4.27	4.93	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	40/ 98	4.29	3.39	3.95	3.86	4.29	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PSYC 601A 0101  
 Title INTERVIEWING  
 Instructor: CARLTON, CHRIST  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1453  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	5	0	3.44	1507/1669	3.44	4.22	4.23	4.35	3.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	1	1	3.22	1545/1666	3.22	4.13	4.19	4.19	3.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1473/1617	3.25	4.15	4.15	4.24	3.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1163/1555	3.63	4.05	4.00	4.07	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	2	1	0	2.50	1516/1543	2.50	4.00	4.06	4.27	2.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	4.15	4.12	4.15	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	6	0	3.67	1274/1605	3.67	3.94	4.07	4.13	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	4	4	0	3.22	1435/1514	3.22	4.35	4.39	4.37	3.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	843/1551	4.78	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1277/1503	3.67	4.18	4.24	4.22	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1236/1506	3.78	4.23	4.26	4.24	3.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	116/1311	4.80	4.08	3.85	3.89	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	417/1490	4.56	3.87	4.05	4.18	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	486/1502	4.67	4.18	4.26	4.46	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	640/1489	4.56	4.22	4.29	4.44	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	453/1006	4.11	3.84	4.00	4.11	4.11	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PSYC 601D 0101  
 Title CORE I  
 Instructor: BAKER, LINDA  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1454  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	5	1	3.42	1520/1669	3.42	4.22	4.23	4.35	3.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	2	5	0	2.67	1624/1666	2.67	4.13	4.19	4.19	2.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1357/1421	3.00	4.15	4.24	4.33	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	5	1	0	2.50	1591/1617	2.50	4.15	4.15	4.24	2.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	5	3	3	1	3.00	1427/1555	3.00	4.05	4.00	4.07	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	3	2	2	0	2.30	1527/1543	2.30	4.00	4.06	4.27	2.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	3	1	4	0	2.42	1596/1647	2.42	4.15	4.12	4.15	2.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	5	5	2	3.75	1210/1605	3.75	3.94	4.07	4.13	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	1199/1514	4.00	4.35	4.39	4.37	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	1330/1551	4.27	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.27	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	1066/1503	4.00	4.18	4.24	4.22	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	5	4	3.82	1219/1506	3.82	4.23	4.26	4.24	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	764/1311	3.80	4.08	3.85	3.89	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	4	2	2	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	3.87	4.05	4.18	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1106/1502	3.92	4.18	4.26	4.46	3.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	1155/1489	3.83	4.22	4.29	4.44	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	4	4	1	0	2.50	967/1006	2.50	3.84	4.00	4.11	2.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	1	1	4	5	0	3.18	97/ 112	3.18	4.06	4.38	4.39	3.18	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	2	1	5	0	3	3.09	90/ 97	3.09	3.56	4.36	4.38	3.09	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	4	3	1	2.91	85/ 92	2.91	3.63	4.22	4.36	2.91	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	4	3	1	3.00	92/ 105	3.00	4.06	4.20	4.23	3.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	4	3	3	1	0	2.09	91/ 98	2.09	3.39	3.95	3.93	2.09	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Under-grad 2
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Non-major 12
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 12

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

Course Section: PSYC 601E 0101  
 Title CORE I  
 Instructor: WALDSTEIN, SHAR  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1455  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	4	3	0	2.67	1634/1669	2.67	4.22	4.23	4.35	2.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	2	3	2	0	2.17	1656/1666	2.17	4.13	4.19	4.19	2.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1390/1421	2.75	4.15	4.24	4.33	2.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	5	5	0	0	2.25	1606/1617	2.25	4.15	4.15	4.24	2.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	5	4	2	0	2.58	1515/1555	2.58	4.05	4.00	4.07	2.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	3	1	2	0	2.10	1533/1543	2.10	4.00	4.06	4.27	2.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	3	2	3	0	2.33	1600/1647	2.33	4.15	4.12	4.15	2.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	641/1668	4.92	4.77	4.67	4.83	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	5	6	0	0	2.42	1567/1605	2.42	3.94	4.07	4.13	2.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	5	4	1	3.25	1431/1514	3.25	4.35	4.39	4.37	3.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	3	1	3	5	3.83	1456/1551	3.83	4.66	4.66	4.72	3.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	5	4	1	3.25	1393/1503	3.25	4.18	4.24	4.22	3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	3	3	1	2.75	1436/1506	2.75	4.23	4.26	4.24	2.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	4	2	4	2	3.33	1027/1311	3.33	4.08	3.85	3.89	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	3	2	1	2.73	1410/1490	2.73	3.87	4.05	4.18	2.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	1319/1502	3.45	4.18	4.26	4.46	3.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	3	3	2	2	3.09	1393/1489	3.09	4.22	4.29	4.44	3.09
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	4	3	1	0	2.44	980/1006	2.44	3.84	4.00	4.11	2.44
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	2	1	3	5	0	3.00	98/ 112	3.00	4.06	4.38	4.39	3.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	4	1	4	0	2	2.55	94/ 97	2.55	3.56	4.36	4.38	2.55
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	3	4	1	3.00	77/ 92	3.00	3.63	4.22	4.36	3.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	4	1	3.09	91/ 105	3.09	4.06	4.20	4.23	3.09
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	4	2	5	0	0	2.09	91/ 98	2.09	3.39	3.95	3.93	2.09
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.40	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PSYC 601F 0101  
 Title POVERTY AND CONSEQUENC  
 Instructor: SONNENSCHNEIN, S  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1456  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	2	4.25	914/1669	4.25	4.22	4.23	4.35	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	549/1666	4.50	4.13	4.19	4.19	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.15	4.24	4.33	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	340/1555	4.50	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	180/1543	4.75	4.00	4.06	4.27	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	4.15	4.12	4.15	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	918/1605	4.00	3.94	4.07	4.13	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.35	4.39	4.37	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1404/1551	4.00	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	879/1503	4.25	4.18	4.24	4.22	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	642/1506	4.50	4.23	4.26	4.24	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	264/1311	4.50	4.08	3.85	3.89	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	692/1490	4.25	3.87	4.05	4.18	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.18	4.26	4.46	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	920/1489	4.25	4.22	4.29	4.44	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.84	4.00	4.11	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PSYC 605 0101  
 Title LEARNING AND COGNITION  
 Instructor: CATANIA, A. CHA  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1457  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	914/1669	4.25	4.22	4.23	4.35	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	2	2	4	3.33	1527/1666	3.33	4.13	4.19	4.19	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	0	2	3	4	3.42	1273/1421	3.42	4.15	4.24	4.33	3.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	5	3	3.75	1251/1617	3.75	4.15	4.15	4.24	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	773/1555	4.00	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	5	3	3.67	1195/1543	3.67	4.00	4.06	4.27	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	1	3	4	3.50	1393/1647	3.50	4.15	4.12	4.15	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	4	2	4	3.82	1164/1605	3.82	3.94	4.07	4.13	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	2	3	1	3	3.09	1449/1514	3.09	4.35	4.39	4.37	3.09	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.66	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	0	2	6	2	3.50	1330/1503	3.50	4.18	4.24	4.22	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	2	0	5	3.27	1372/1506	3.27	4.23	4.26	4.24	3.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	4	1	5	3.67	846/1311	3.67	4.08	3.85	3.89	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	2	1	2	2	2.80	1395/1490	2.80	3.87	4.05	4.18	2.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	4	1	1	3	3.10	1392/1502	3.10	4.18	4.26	4.46	3.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	3	2	1	2	2	2.80	1434/1489	2.80	4.22	4.29	4.44	2.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 4
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 9
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 1		

Course Section: PSYC 606 0101  
 Title ADULT PSYCHOPATHOLOGY  
 Instructor: MURPHY, CHRISTO  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1458  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	3	4.14	1052/1669	4.14	4.22	4.23	4.35	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1353/1666	3.71	4.13	4.19	4.19	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.15	4.24	4.33	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	418/1555	4.43	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	895/1543	4.00	4.00	4.06	4.27	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1205/1647	3.86	4.15	4.12	4.15	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1400/1605	3.40	3.94	4.07	4.13	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	3	1	1	3.14	1444/1514	3.14	4.35	4.39	4.37	3.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1452/1551	3.86	4.66	4.66	4.72	3.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	3.57	1309/1503	3.57	4.18	4.24	4.22	3.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	995/1506	4.14	4.23	4.26	4.24	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1227/1311	2.50	4.08	3.85	3.89	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	405/1490	4.57	3.87	4.05	4.18	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	859/1502	4.29	4.18	4.26	4.46	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	622/1489	4.57	4.22	4.29	4.44	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	759/1006	3.50	3.84	4.00	4.11	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PSYC 611 0101  
 Title: DATA ANALYTIC PROC I  
 Instructor: PITTS, STEVEN C (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1459  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	16	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	159/1669	4.87	4.22	4.23	4.35	4.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	16	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	268/1666	4.73	4.13	4.19	4.19	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	17	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	184/1421	4.86	4.15	4.24	4.33	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	16	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	554/1617	4.47	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	141/1555	4.80	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	298/1543	4.60	4.00	4.06	4.27	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	16	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	446/1647	4.53	4.15	4.12	4.15	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	16	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	194/1605	4.23	3.94	4.07	4.13	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1514	4.73	4.35	4.39	4.37	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1551	4.61	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	300/1503	4.41	4.18	4.24	4.22	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	115/1506	4.51	4.23	4.26	4.24	4.51	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	12	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1311	4.08	4.08	3.85	3.89	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	0	6	3	4	3.47	1178/1490	3.47	3.87	4.05	4.18	3.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	3	3	5	2	2	2.80	1439/1502	2.80	4.18	4.26	4.46	2.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	2	1	3	2	5	3.54	1266/1489	3.54	4.22	4.29	4.44	3.54	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	13	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	4.11	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	128/ 226	4.23	4.08	4.20	4.47	4.23	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	60/ 233	4.69	4.50	4.19	4.41	4.69	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	1	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	43/ 225	4.92	4.72	4.50	4.65	4.92	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	1	3	1	8	4.23	148/ 223	4.23	4.51	4.35	4.48	4.23	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	3	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	63/ 206	4.60	4.69	4.15	4.39	4.60	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.38	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.23	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	3.93	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.57	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.31	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.45	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.40	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.61	****	



Course Section: PSYC 611 0101  
 Title DATA ANALYTIC PROC I  
 Instructor: PITTS, STEVEN C (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1459  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	4	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	11	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	31
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course Section: PSYC 611 0101  
 Title DATA ANALYTIC PROC I  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1460  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	16	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	159/1669	4.87	4.22	4.23	4.35	4.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	16	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	268/1666	4.73	4.13	4.19	4.19	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	17	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	184/1421	4.86	4.15	4.24	4.33	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	16	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	554/1617	4.47	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	141/1555	4.80	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	298/1543	4.60	4.00	4.06	4.27	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	16	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	446/1647	4.53	4.15	4.12	4.15	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	16	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	0	0	0	4	7	1	3.75	1210/1605	4.23	3.94	4.07	4.13	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	861/1514	4.73	4.35	4.39	4.37	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	1354/1551	4.61	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1030/1503	4.41	4.18	4.24	4.22	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	1038/1506	4.51	4.23	4.26	4.24	4.51	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	0	0	1	4	1	7	4.08	552/1311	4.08	4.08	3.85	3.89	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	0	6	3	4	3.47	1178/1490	3.47	3.87	4.05	4.18	3.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	3	3	5	2	2	2.80	1439/1502	2.80	4.18	4.26	4.46	2.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	2	1	3	2	5	3.54	1266/1489	3.54	4.22	4.29	4.44	3.54	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	13	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	4.11	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	128/ 226	4.23	4.08	4.20	4.47	4.23	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	60/ 233	4.69	4.50	4.19	4.41	4.69	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	1	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	43/ 225	4.92	4.72	4.50	4.65	4.92	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	1	3	1	8	4.23	148/ 223	4.23	4.51	4.35	4.48	4.23	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	3	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	63/ 206	4.60	4.69	4.15	4.39	4.60	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.38	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.23	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	3.93	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.57	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.31	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.45	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.40	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.61	****	

Course Section: PSYC 611 0101  
 Title DATA ANALYTIC PROC I  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1460  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	4	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	11	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	31
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course Section: PSYC 620 0101  
 Title: METHODS OF ASSESSMENT  
 Instructor: DELUTY, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1461  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	6	4.86	167/1669	4.86	4.22	4.23	4.35	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	841/1666	4.29	4.13	4.19	4.19	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	557/1421	4.50	4.15	4.24	4.33	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	424/1617	4.57	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	418/1555	4.43	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	325/1543	4.57	4.00	4.06	4.27	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1295/1647	3.71	4.15	4.12	4.15	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	320/1605	4.57	3.94	4.07	4.13	4.57	
-----															
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	274/1514	4.86	4.35	4.39	4.37	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.66	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	323/1503	4.71	4.18	4.24	4.22	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	225/1506	4.86	4.23	4.26	4.24	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	587/1311	4.00	4.08	3.85	3.89	4.00	
-----															
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	298/1490	4.71	3.87	4.05	4.18	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	729/1502	4.43	4.18	4.26	4.46	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1038/1489	4.00	4.22	4.29	4.44	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	159/1006	4.71	3.84	4.00	4.11	4.71	

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 6		Graduate 7
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 0
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course Section: PSYC 623 0101  
 Title CLINICAL INTERVENTN II  
 Instructor: DICLEMENTE, CAR  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1462  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	2	1	2.86	1623/1669	2.86	4.22	4.23	4.35	2.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1561/1666	3.14	4.13	4.19	4.19	3.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1135/1421	3.75	4.15	4.24	4.33	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	1196/1617	3.86	4.15	4.15	4.24	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1095/1555	3.71	4.05	4.00	4.07	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	1336/1543	3.29	4.00	4.06	4.27	3.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	0	1	1	2.29	1603/1647	2.29	4.15	4.12	4.15	2.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1400/1605	3.40	3.94	4.07	4.13	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1375/1514	3.57	4.35	4.39	4.37	3.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1135/1551	4.57	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	0	2	2	3.43	1358/1503	3.43	4.18	4.24	4.22	3.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	2	1	3.00	1403/1506	3.00	4.23	4.26	4.24	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	2	2	0	2	3.00	1115/1311	3.00	4.08	3.85	3.89	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	1	0	2	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	3.87	4.05	4.18	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1231/1502	3.71	4.18	4.26	4.46	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	622/1489	4.57	4.22	4.29	4.44	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	2	2	0	2	3.33	841/1006	3.33	3.84	4.00	4.11	3.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.38	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.23	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	3.93	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PSYC 636 0101  
 Title PRIMARY PREVENTION  
 Instructor: REINKE, WENDY  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1463  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1052/1669	4.14	4.22	4.23	4.35	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	3.86	1273/1666	3.86	4.13	4.19	4.19	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1421	****	4.15	4.24	4.33	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	3.86	1196/1617	3.86	4.15	4.15	4.24	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	418/1555	4.43	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	3.57	1236/1543	3.57	4.00	4.06	4.27	3.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	401/1647	4.57	4.15	4.12	4.15	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1241/1605	3.71	3.94	4.07	4.13	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1199/1514	4.00	4.35	4.39	4.37	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	954/1551	4.71	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1189/1503	3.86	4.18	4.24	4.22	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	1403/1506	3.00	4.23	4.26	4.24	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1311	****	4.08	3.85	3.89	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	778/1490	4.14	3.87	4.05	4.18	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	286/1502	4.86	4.18	4.26	4.46	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	622/1489	4.57	4.22	4.29	4.44	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	479/1006	4.00	3.84	4.00	4.11	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.23	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	3.93	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PSYC 655 0101  
 Title ADV TOP A BEHAV AN  
 Instructor: KAHNG, SUNG W  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1464  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	207/1669	4.80	4.22	4.23	4.35	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	103/1666	4.90	4.13	4.19	4.19	4.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	****	4.15	4.24	4.33	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	114/1617	4.90	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1555	5.00	4.05	4.00	4.07	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	226/1543	4.70	4.00	4.06	4.27	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1647	5.00	4.15	4.12	4.15	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	1039/1668	4.70	4.77	4.67	4.83	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	239/1605	4.67	3.94	4.07	4.13	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	308/1514	4.83	4.35	4.39	4.37	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.66	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.18	4.24	4.22	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.23	4.26	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1311	****	4.08	3.85	3.89	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1490	5.00	3.87	4.05	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.18	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.22	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.84	4.00	4.11	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PSYC 695A 0101  
 Title FAMILY THERAPY  
 Instructor: SCHAEFFER, CYNT  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1465  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	159/1669	4.87	4.22	4.23	4.35	4.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	439/1666	4.60	4.13	4.19	4.19	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.15	4.24	4.33	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	394/1617	4.60	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	316/1555	4.53	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	195/1543	4.73	4.00	4.06	4.27	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	851/1647	4.27	4.15	4.12	4.15	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	1257/1668	4.43	4.77	4.67	4.83	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	350/1605	4.53	3.94	4.07	4.13	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	861/1514	4.47	4.35	4.39	4.37	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	622/1551	4.87	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	300/1503	4.73	4.18	4.24	4.22	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	212/1506	4.87	4.23	4.26	4.24	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	264/1311	4.50	4.08	3.85	3.89	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	428/1490	4.54	3.87	4.05	4.18	4.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.18	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	224/1489	4.92	4.22	4.29	4.44	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	88/1006	4.92	3.84	4.00	4.11	4.92	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	44/ 112	4.86	4.06	4.38	4.39	4.86	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.38	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	33/ 105	4.80	4.06	4.20	4.23	4.80	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	3	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	46/ 98	4.00	3.39	3.95	3.93	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course Section: PSYC 695B 0101  
 Title: SOCIAL HEALTH  
 Instructor: BEDIAKO, SHAWN  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1466  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	3	4	4	1	3.08	1591/1669	3.08	4.22	4.23	4.35	3.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	2	6	1	1	2.62	1630/1666	2.62	4.13	4.19	4.19	2.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1421	****	4.15	4.24	4.33	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	2	4	2	1	3.00	1516/1617	3.00	4.15	4.15	4.24	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	3	4	2	3.31	1336/1555	3.31	4.05	4.00	4.07	3.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	2	5	2	1	2.83	1476/1543	2.83	4.00	4.06	4.27	2.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	3	5	2	2	0	2.25	1607/1647	2.25	4.15	4.12	4.15	2.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	9	3	4.15	1444/1668	4.15	4.77	4.67	4.83	4.15	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	5	0	3.56	1334/1605	3.56	3.94	4.07	4.13	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	2	3	3	1	3.10	1449/1514	3.10	4.35	4.39	4.37	3.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	788/1551	4.80	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1366/1503	3.40	4.18	4.24	4.22	3.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	6	2	1	3.30	1368/1506	3.30	4.23	4.26	4.24	3.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	998/1490	3.82	3.87	4.05	4.18	3.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	693/1502	4.45	4.18	4.26	4.46	4.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	909/1489	4.27	4.22	4.29	4.44	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	447/1006	4.13	3.84	4.00	4.11	4.13	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	6	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	8	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course Section: PSYC 695C 0101  
 Title ADDICTIONS  
 Instructor: DICLEMENTE, CAR  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1467  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	5	7	4.58	500/1669	4.58	4.22	4.23	4.35	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	777/1666	4.33	4.13	4.19	4.19	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	****	4.15	4.24	4.33	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	394/1617	4.60	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	340/1555	4.50	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	759/1543	4.17	4.00	4.06	4.27	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	4.15	4.12	4.15	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	343/1605	4.55	3.94	4.07	4.13	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	308/1514	4.83	4.35	4.39	4.37	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.66	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	277/1503	4.75	4.18	4.24	4.22	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	249/1506	4.83	4.23	4.26	4.24	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	158/1311	4.73	4.08	3.85	3.89	4.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	692/1490	4.25	3.87	4.05	4.18	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	393/1502	4.75	4.18	4.26	4.46	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	434/1489	4.75	4.22	4.29	4.44	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	479/1006	4.00	3.84	4.00	4.11	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PSYC 715 0101  
 Title MEASUREMENT OF BEHAVIO  
 Instructor: STAPLETON, LAUR  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1468  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	389/1669	4.67	4.22	4.23	4.35	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	425/1666	4.61	4.13	4.19	4.19	4.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	255/1421	4.78	4.15	4.24	4.33	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	128/1617	4.88	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	5	6	3.50	1227/1555	3.50	4.05	4.00	4.07	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	316/1543	4.59	4.00	4.06	4.27	4.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	302/1647	4.67	4.15	4.12	4.15	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	8	7	4.24	713/1605	4.24	3.94	4.07	4.13	4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	308/1514	4.83	4.35	4.39	4.37	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.66	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	742/1503	4.39	4.18	4.24	4.22	4.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	394/1506	4.72	4.23	4.26	4.24	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	2	2	3	10	4.24	458/1311	4.24	4.08	3.85	3.89	4.24	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	956/1490	3.91	3.87	4.05	4.18	3.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	326/1502	4.82	4.18	4.26	4.46	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	742/1489	4.45	4.22	4.29	4.44	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	167/1006	4.70	3.84	4.00	4.11	4.70	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	4.47	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.41	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.72	4.50	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.51	4.35	4.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PSYC 720 0101  
 Title INFANT ASSESSMENT  
 Instructor: HUSSEY-GARDNER,  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1469  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	6	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.22	4.23	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.13	4.19	4.19	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.15	4.24	4.33	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.15	4.15	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	225/1555	4.67	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.00	4.06	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1647	5.00	4.15	4.12	4.15	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	844/1668	4.83	4.77	4.67	4.83	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	139/1605	4.80	3.94	4.07	4.13	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.35	4.39	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.66	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.18	4.24	4.22	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.23	4.26	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1311	5.00	4.08	3.85	3.89	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1490	5.00	3.87	4.05	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.18	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.22	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.84	4.00	4.11	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PSYC 741 0101  
 Title TOPICS IN BEH MED  
 Instructor: WALDSTEIN, SHAR  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1470  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	5	5	6	3.74	1379/1669	3.74	4.22	4.23	4.35	3.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	6	3	6	3.42	1502/1666	3.42	4.13	4.19	4.19	3.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	****	4.15	4.24	4.33	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1184/1617	3.88	4.15	4.15	4.24	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	5	5	3	5	3.44	1272/1555	3.44	4.05	4.00	4.07	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	4	2	2	1	2	2.55	1510/1543	2.55	4.00	4.06	4.27	2.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	8	1	0	6	2	2	3.36	1459/1647	3.36	4.15	4.12	4.15	3.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	1	1	9	6	1	3.28	1449/1605	3.28	3.94	4.07	4.13	3.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	1058/1514	4.29	4.35	4.39	4.37	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	1127/1551	4.59	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.59	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	5	4	8	4.18	950/1503	4.18	4.18	4.24	4.22	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	909/1506	4.25	4.23	4.26	4.24	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	483/1311	4.20	4.08	3.85	3.89	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	5	5	4	3.47	1172/1490	3.47	3.87	4.05	4.18	3.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	0	1	2	12	4.29	852/1502	4.29	4.18	4.26	4.46	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	846/1489	4.35	4.22	4.29	4.44	4.35	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	10	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	178/1006	4.67	3.84	4.00	4.11	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	2	0	4	7	4.23	79/ 112	4.23	4.06	4.38	4.39	4.23	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	10	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.38	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	2	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	58/ 105	4.36	4.06	4.20	4.23	4.36	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	10	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	3.93	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Under-grad 5
Grad.	14	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				I 0	Other 18
				? 0	

Course Section: PSYC 781 0101  
 Title SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT  
 Instructor: SCHULTZ, DAVID  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1471  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	4	4	1	1	1	2.18	1662/1669	2.18	4.22	4.23	4.35	2.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	3	3	1	0	2.09	1659/1666	2.09	4.13	4.19	4.19	2.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1357/1421	3.00	4.15	4.24	4.33	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	4	4	0	1	2.45	1595/1617	2.45	4.15	4.15	4.24	2.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	1	3	3.09	1414/1555	3.09	4.05	4.00	4.07	3.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	3	3	1	3.00	1410/1543	3.00	4.00	4.06	4.27	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	6	3	0	0	2	2.00	1619/1647	2.00	4.15	4.12	4.15	2.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1096/1668	4.64	4.77	4.67	4.83	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	3	3	2	1	0	2.11	1581/1605	2.11	3.94	4.07	4.13	2.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	4	2	2	0	2.27	1493/1514	2.27	4.35	4.39	4.37	2.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	1364/1551	4.18	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.18	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	4	3	0	1	2.27	1480/1503	2.27	4.18	4.24	4.22	2.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	3	2	1	1	2.27	1481/1506	2.27	4.23	4.26	4.24	2.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	2	3	1	2	3.11	1100/1311	3.11	4.08	3.85	3.89	3.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	2	4	0	0	1.91	1478/1490	1.91	3.87	4.05	4.18	1.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	2	1	1	6	3.82	1172/1502	3.82	4.18	4.26	4.46	3.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	2	2	2	4	3.55	1262/1489	3.55	4.22	4.29	4.44	3.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	3	3	0	2	2	2.70	960/1006	2.70	3.84	4.00	4.11	2.70	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	3.93	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

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