

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	17	37	66	4.34	781/1447	4.27	4.29	4.31	4.18	4.34
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	1	17	47	55	4.22	892/1447	4.09	4.13	4.27	4.30	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	7	10	33	72	4.37	692/1241	4.24	4.17	4.33	4.25	4.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	38	4	4	14	24	39	4.06	943/1402	3.97	4.10	4.24	4.15	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	8	22	89	4.65	244/1358	4.61	4.19	4.11	4.03	4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	56	8	4	11	17	26	3.74	1002/1316	3.72	4.03	4.14	3.99	3.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	5	15	33	68	4.33	692/1427	4.26	4.13	4.19	4.24	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	3	0	1	1	5	112	4.92	436/1447	4.88	4.70	4.69	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	2	1	2	16	45	36	4.13	765/1434	3.93	3.97	4.10	4.10	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	3	19	39	60	4.26	1031/1387	4.41	4.37	4.46	4.46	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	5	21	95	4.74	874/1387	4.67	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	17	29	72	4.40	748/1386	4.36	4.26	4.32	4.32	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	9	9	22	21	60	3.94	1074/1380	3.94	4.23	4.32	4.31	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	8	15	35	61	4.22	501/1193	4.34	4.06	4.02	3.99	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	52	0	6	5	9	21	31	3.92	791/1172	3.65	4.02	4.15	3.95	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	49	0	2	4	10	12	47	4.31	714/1182	4.19	4.21	4.35	4.18	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	48	0	1	2	9	13	51	4.46	608/1170	4.29	4.34	4.38	4.17	4.46
4. Were special techniques successful	48	19	4	7	8	18	20	3.75	581/ 800	3.85	3.93	4.06	3.95	3.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	107	3	0	2	2	3	7	4.07	****/ 189	****	3.10	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	110	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	****/ 192	****	3.71	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	109	2	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	****/ 186	****	4.10	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	108	7	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	****/ 187	****	3.95	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	109	7	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	****/ 168	****	4.17	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	112	5	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	****/ 66	****	4.88	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	114	5	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 62	****	4.63	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	114	6	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 58	****	4.63	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	114	3	1	1	1	0	4	3.71	****/ 65	****	4.63	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	115	5	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 64	****	4.50	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	115	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	115	0	2	0	3	1	3	3.33	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	115	2	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	116	2	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	114	4	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	114	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	115	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	115	1	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	116	1	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	116	1	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: PSYC 100 01  
 Title Intro To Psychology  
 Instructor: Garrett,Adia J  
 Enrollment: 196  
 Questionnaires: 124

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1187  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	31	0.00-0.99	2	A	46	Required for Majors	32	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	23	1.00-1.99	4	B	46						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	11	C	15	General	49	Under-grad	124	Non-major	119
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	22	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	21	F	0	Electives	21	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	3						

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	3	0	3	5	14	18	52	4.21	919/1447	4.27	4.29	4.31	4.18	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	2	3	21	35	29	3.96	1097/1447	4.09	4.13	4.27	4.30	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	4	3	10	35	39	4.12	866/1241	4.24	4.17	4.33	4.25	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	34	4	4	11	13	24	3.88	1094/1402	3.97	4.10	4.24	4.15	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	2	0	1	6	22	56	4.56	306/1358	4.61	4.19	4.11	4.03	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	10	48	2	3	12	7	13	3.70	1026/1316	3.72	4.03	4.14	3.99	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	3	4	11	25	44	4.18	850/1427	4.26	4.13	4.19	4.24	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	2	1	0	1	7	77	4.85	646/1447	4.88	4.70	4.69	4.68	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	3	2	2	22	34	13	3.74	1103/1434	3.93	3.97	4.10	4.10	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	2	2	4	17	64	4.56	712/1387	4.41	4.37	4.46	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	1	5	19	63	4.60	1063/1387	4.67	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	2	2	11	23	49	4.32	820/1386	4.36	4.26	4.32	4.32	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	8	6	8	27	38	3.93	1081/1380	3.94	4.23	4.32	4.31	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	3	2	8	15	61	4.45	340/1193	4.34	4.06	4.02	3.99	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	56	0	7	3	8	10	11	3.38	1029/1172	3.65	4.02	4.15	3.95	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	57	0	2	3	5	8	20	4.08	839/1182	4.19	4.21	4.35	4.18	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	56	0	1	4	6	6	22	4.13	839/1170	4.29	4.34	4.38	4.17	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	56	7	1	2	6	12	11	3.94	485/ 800	3.85	3.93	4.06	3.95	3.94
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	83	2	2	0	0	1	7	4.10	****/ 189	****	3.10	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	84	0	2	1	0	1	7	3.91	****/ 192	****	3.71	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	86	2	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	****/ 186	****	4.10	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	86	4	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 187	****	3.95	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	87	3	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/ 168	****	4.17	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	88	2	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/ 66	****	4.88	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	90	1	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 62	****	4.63	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	90	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	4.63	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	90	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 65	****	4.63	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	90	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 64	****	4.50	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	90	0	3	0	0	1	1	2.40	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	91	0	3	0	0	1	0	1.75	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	90	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	90	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	90	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	89	0	2	1	0	0	3	3.17	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	90	1	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	90	1	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	90	1	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	90	1	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: PSYC 100 02  
 Title Intro To Psychology  
 Instructor: O'Brien,Eileen  
 Enrollment: 195  
 Questionnaires: 95

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1188  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	26	0.00-0.99	5	A	30	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	35						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	13	General	36	Under-grad	95	Non-major	91
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	16	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	19	F	0	Electives	10	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	2	3	12	23	4.40	723/1447	4.46	4.29	4.31	4.31	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	2	4	7	26	4.38	715/1447	4.43	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	3	5	8	24	4.32	726/1241	4.44	4.17	4.33	4.35	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	7	0	3	2	8	19	4.34	675/1402	4.31	4.10	4.24	4.24	4.34
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	10	26	4.56	306/1358	4.55	4.19	4.11	4.12	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	9	2	0	4	10	14	4.13	729/1316	4.12	4.03	4.14	4.08	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	4	7	25	4.36	656/1427	4.59	4.13	4.19	4.14	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	26	13	4.33	1202/1447	4.58	4.70	4.69	4.70	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	0	2	8	14	4	3.71	1117/1434	4.15	3.97	4.10	3.97	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	3	13	21	4.36	951/1387	4.59	4.37	4.46	4.42	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	5	32	4.74	874/1387	4.86	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	4	12	22	4.47	649/1386	4.60	4.26	4.32	4.24	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	2	2	12	20	4.30	849/1380	4.40	4.23	4.32	4.30	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	2	12	24	4.58	243/1193	4.61	4.06	4.02	4.04	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	1	4	9	9	4.00	710/1172	4.12	4.02	4.15	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	2	4	7	10	4.09	836/1182	4.23	4.21	4.35	4.30	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	2	3	8	11	4.17	816/1170	4.45	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	18	3	0	2	3	8	8	4.05	416/ 800	3.84	3.93	4.06	4.01	4.05
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	3.10	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	3.71	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.10	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	3.95	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	4.17	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.88	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.63	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.63	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.63	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	4.50	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: PSYC 200 01  
 Title Child Developmental Ps  
 Instructor: Scaletti, Laura  
 Enrollment: 80  
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1189  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	42	Non-major	32
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	9	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	6	21	29	4.41	709/1447	4.46	4.29	4.31	4.31	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	16	33	4.45	619/1447	4.43	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	16	38	4.63	427/1241	4.44	4.17	4.33	4.35	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	20	0	1	7	16	12	4.08	923/1402	4.31	4.10	4.24	4.24	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	7	10	38	4.52	338/1358	4.55	4.19	4.11	4.12	4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	23	3	0	8	12	8	3.71	1026/1316	4.12	4.03	4.14	4.08	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	7	43	4.64	301/1427	4.59	4.13	4.19	4.14	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	1	0	3	51	4.82	700/1447	4.58	4.70	4.69	4.70	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	5	24	18	4.28	611/1434	4.15	3.97	4.10	3.97	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	12	43	4.75	429/1387	4.59	4.37	4.46	4.42	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	50	4.89	553/1387	4.86	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	13	40	4.66	431/1386	4.60	4.26	4.32	4.24	4.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	9	18	28	4.35	807/1380	4.40	4.23	4.32	4.30	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	6	11	36	4.57	249/1193	4.61	4.06	4.02	4.04	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	2	3	1	13	11	3.93	773/1172	4.12	4.02	4.15	4.12	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	2	8	6	14	4.07	841/1182	4.23	4.21	4.35	4.30	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	0	6	9	15	4.30	733/1170	4.45	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	27	8	3	3	8	3	5	3.18	731/ 800	3.84	3.93	4.06	4.01	3.18
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 189	****	3.10	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 192	****	3.71	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 186	****	4.10	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 187	****	3.95	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 168	****	4.17	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 66	****	4.88	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 62	****	4.63	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.63	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.63	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 64	****	4.50	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: PSYC 200 02  
 Title Child Developmental Ps  
 Instructor: Schultz,David A  
 Enrollment: 79  
 Questionnaires: 57

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1190  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	A	16	Required for Majors	29	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B	25						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	7	Under-grad	57	Non-major	39
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	9	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	10	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	0	4	12	37	4.56	529/1447	4.46	4.29	4.31	4.31	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	5	11	36	4.48	561/1447	4.43	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	5	17	29	4.36	700/1241	4.44	4.17	4.33	4.35	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	2	5	11	35	4.49	506/1402	4.31	4.10	4.24	4.24	4.49
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	7	10	37	4.56	312/1358	4.55	4.19	4.11	4.12	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	4	15	34	4.52	382/1316	4.12	4.03	4.14	4.08	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	9	42	4.75	200/1427	4.59	4.13	4.19	4.14	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	22	31	4.58	1030/1447	4.58	4.70	4.69	4.70	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	2	23	24	4.45	408/1434	4.15	3.97	4.10	3.97	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	10	39	4.66	566/1387	4.59	4.37	4.46	4.42	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	50	4.94	317/1387	4.86	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	4	9	40	4.68	418/1386	4.60	4.26	4.32	4.24	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	5	11	36	4.55	615/1380	4.40	4.23	4.32	4.30	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	15	37	4.68	180/1193	4.61	4.06	4.02	4.04	4.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	1	1	8	13	4.43	437/1172	4.12	4.02	4.15	4.12	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	33	0	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	540/1182	4.23	4.21	4.35	4.30	4.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	264/1170	4.45	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.87
4. Were special techniques successful	32	6	0	0	6	1	11	4.28	324/ 800	3.84	3.93	4.06	4.01	4.28
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	54	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 189	****	3.10	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	****	3.71	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 186	****	4.10	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 187	****	3.95	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 168	****	4.17	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	4.88	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.63	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.63	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.63	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	4.50	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	****	****

Course-Section: PSYC 200 03  
 Title Child Developmental Ps  
 Instructor: Garrett, Adia J  
 Enrollment: 83  
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1191  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	0	A	25	Required for Majors	32	Graduate	0	Major	25
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	14	C	8	General	9	Under-grad	56	Non-major	31
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 204 1  
 Title Diversity & Pluralism  
 Instructor: Pincus, Fred L  
 Enrollment: 49  
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1192  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	2	6	12	17	4.11	1007/1447	4.11	4.29	4.31	4.31	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	6	17	14	4.13	965/1447	4.13	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	8	9	20	4.26	774/1241	4.26	4.17	4.33	4.35	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	3	0	0	10	10	14	4.12	900/1402	4.12	4.10	4.24	4.24	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	3	8	25	4.47	377/1358	4.47	4.19	4.11	4.12	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	0	11	10	12	3.94	870/1316	3.94	4.03	4.14	4.08	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	4	9	13	11	3.84	1123/1427	3.84	4.13	4.19	4.14	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	19	18	4.42	1139/1447	4.42	4.70	4.69	4.70	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	0	2	9	14	6	3.77	1073/1434	3.77	3.97	4.10	3.97	3.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	2	9	21	4.59	670/1387	4.59	4.37	4.46	4.42	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	2	1	0	6	23	4.47	1167/1387	4.47	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	1	1	9	20	4.44	705/1386	4.44	4.26	4.32	4.24	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	1	6	22	4.44	729/1380	4.44	4.23	4.32	4.30	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	1	3	1	13	14	4.13	593/1193	4.13	4.06	4.02	4.04	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	3	4	20	4.63	309/1172	4.63	4.02	4.15	4.12	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	3	4	20	4.63	470/1182	4.63	4.21	4.35	4.30	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	3	22	4.74	402/1170	4.74	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.74
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	1	8	8	9	3.96	458/ 800	3.96	3.93	4.06	4.01	3.96
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.88	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	****	4.63	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.63	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.63	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	4.50	4.09	3.70	****
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 8
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 13	General 13
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	7	C 9	
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	Electives 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F 0	
				P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				I 0	
				? 3	
					Other 2

Course-Section: PSYC 205 01  
 Title Before We Were Born  
 Instructor: Freiberg, Karen  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1193  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	222/1447	4.83	4.29	4.31	4.31	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	479/1447	4.56	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	675/1241	4.39	4.17	4.33	4.35	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1153/1402	3.78	4.10	4.24	4.24	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	2	10	4.38	485/1358	4.38	4.19	4.11	4.12	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1134/1316	3.50	4.03	4.14	4.08	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	500/1427	4.47	4.13	4.19	4.14	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	803/1447	4.78	4.70	4.69	4.70	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	3	6	7	4.06	823/1434	4.06	3.97	4.10	3.97	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	596/1387	4.65	4.37	4.46	4.42	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	317/1387	4.94	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	0	5	10	4.35	793/1386	4.35	4.26	4.32	4.24	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	491/1380	4.65	4.23	4.32	4.30	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	7	9	4.41	367/1193	4.41	4.06	4.02	4.04	4.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	2	0	3	3.29	1053/1172	3.29	4.02	4.15	4.12	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1023/1182	3.71	4.21	4.35	4.30	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	998/1170	3.71	4.34	4.38	4.32	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	683/ 800	3.40	3.93	4.06	4.01	3.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 18	Non-major 15
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 9	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PSYC 210 01  
 Title Psychology Of Learning  
 Instructor: Borrero,John C  
 Enrollment: 102  
 Questionnaires: 85

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1194  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	1	2	25	54	4.57	518/1447	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.31	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	7	74	4.89	120/1447	4.23	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	11	69	4.82	222/1241	4.18	4.17	4.33	4.35	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	32	1	1	6	6	37	4.51	494/1402	4.05	4.10	4.24	4.24	4.51
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	9	6	12	20	34	3.79	994/1358	3.90	4.19	4.11	4.12	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	60	2	1	0	5	15	4.30	572/1316	3.71	4.03	4.14	4.08	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	5	77	4.92	77/1427	4.47	4.13	4.19	4.14	4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	4	78	4.95	243/1447	4.92	4.70	4.69	4.70	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	0	0	1	16	53	4.74	166/1434	4.09	3.97	4.10	3.97	4.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	80	4.96	80/1387	4.59	4.37	4.46	4.42	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	82	4.99	106/1387	4.51	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.99
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	9	72	4.89	159/1386	4.28	4.26	4.32	4.24	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	78	4.94	111/1380	4.30	4.23	4.32	4.30	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	5	77	4.94	45/1193	4.22	4.06	4.02	4.04	4.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	2	2	9	30	4.56	350/1172	3.86	4.02	4.15	4.12	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	41	0	0	1	2	7	34	4.68	410/1182	3.90	4.21	4.35	4.30	4.68
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	41	0	1	0	1	6	36	4.73	427/1170	4.01	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	39	29	5	0	0	1	11	3.76	****/ 800	3.60	3.93	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	80	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 189	****	3.10	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	81	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 192	****	3.71	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	81	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.10	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	81	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 187	****	3.95	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	81	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 168	****	4.17	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	80	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.88	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	81	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.63	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	81	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.63	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	81	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.63	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	81	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 64	****	4.50	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	81	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	81	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	82	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	82	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	82	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	82	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	82	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	82	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	82	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	82	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: PSYC 210 01  
 Title Psychology Of Learning  
 Instructor: Borrero,John C  
 Enrollment: 102  
 Questionnaires: 85

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1194  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	49	Required for Majors	62	Graduate	0	Major	50
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	26						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	14	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	85	Non-major	35
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	15	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	4	12	28	16	13	3.30	1373/1447	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.31	3.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	3	6	26	21	16	3.57	1300/1447	4.23	4.13	4.27	4.23	3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	6	27	13	26	3.78	1059/1241	4.18	4.17	4.33	4.35	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	24	3	5	14	14	12	3.56	1241/1402	4.05	4.10	4.24	4.24	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	6	7	16	14	26	3.68	1070/1358	3.90	4.19	4.11	4.12	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	38	1	6	12	3	9	3.42	1168/1316	3.71	4.03	4.14	4.08	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	1	14	16	38	4.32	704/1427	4.47	4.13	4.19	4.14	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	1	0	0	1	3	63	4.93	388/1447	4.92	4.70	4.69	4.70	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	3	4	6	23	16	6	3.25	1312/1434	4.09	3.97	4.10	3.97	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	4	10	15	42	4.29	1007/1387	4.59	4.37	4.46	4.42	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	2	7	14	16	33	3.99	1324/1387	4.51	4.72	4.73	4.71	3.99
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	5	8	19	16	24	3.64	1228/1386	4.28	4.26	4.32	4.24	3.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	9	10	11	15	25	3.53	1240/1380	4.30	4.23	4.32	4.30	3.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	5	5	4	16	16	21	3.71	874/1193	4.22	4.06	4.02	4.04	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	46	0	10	3	7	4	6	2.77	1137/1172	3.86	4.02	4.15	4.12	2.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	49	0	8	2	10	1	6	2.81	1151/1182	3.90	4.21	4.35	4.30	2.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	48	0	5	6	10	1	6	2.89	1142/1170	4.01	4.34	4.38	4.32	2.89
4. Were special techniques successful	48	16	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	****/ 800	3.60	3.93	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	73	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 189	****	3.10	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	73	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 192	****	3.71	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	73	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 186	****	4.10	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	73	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 187	****	3.95	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	73	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 168	****	4.17	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	73	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 66	****	4.88	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	73	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 62	****	4.63	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	73	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.63	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	73	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 65	****	4.63	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	73	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 64	****	4.50	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	75	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	74	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	74	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	74	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	74	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	74	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	73	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	73	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	73	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	73	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: PSYC 210 02  
 Title Psychology Of Learning  
 Instructor: Kahng, Sungwoo  
 Enrollment: 103  
 Questionnaires: 76

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1195  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	38	Graduate	0	Major	26
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	27						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	10	General	6	Under-grad	76	Non-major	50
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	13	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	9	6	4.12	998/1447	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.31	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	5	9	4.24	872/1447	4.23	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	0	8	6	3.94	962/1241	4.18	4.17	4.33	4.35	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	916/1402	4.05	4.10	4.24	4.24	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	626/1358	3.90	4.19	4.11	4.12	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1172/1316	3.71	4.03	4.14	4.08	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	858/1427	4.47	4.13	4.19	4.14	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	538/1447	4.92	4.70	4.69	4.70	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	623/1434	4.09	3.97	4.10	3.97	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	798/1387	4.59	4.37	4.46	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	1090/1387	4.51	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	829/1386	4.28	4.26	4.32	4.24	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	3	11	4.44	729/1380	4.30	4.23	4.32	4.30	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	1	1	3	9	4.00	652/1193	4.22	4.06	4.02	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	2	9	4.27	573/1172	3.86	4.02	4.15	4.12	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	2	2	2	9	4.20	767/1182	3.90	4.21	4.35	4.30	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	2	1	1	11	4.40	657/1170	4.01	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	2	10	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	630/ 800	3.60	3.93	4.06	4.01	3.60
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	****	3.71	4.34	4.38	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	4.88	4.58	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.63	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	4.50	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.25	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	****	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 285 01  
 Title Abnormal Psychology  
 Instructor: Dahlquist, Lynnd  
 Enrollment: 79  
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1197  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	1	1	9	48	4.76	298/1447	4.40	4.29	4.31	4.31	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	4	13	42	4.64	376/1447	4.37	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	16	41	4.66	380/1241	4.43	4.17	4.33	4.35	4.66
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	27	1	0	3	5	23	4.53	459/1402	4.14	4.10	4.24	4.24	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	0	6	10	42	4.62	265/1358	4.36	4.19	4.11	4.12	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	34	1	1	2	5	17	4.38	512/1316	4.00	4.03	4.14	4.08	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	6	9	45	4.65	292/1427	4.32	4.13	4.19	4.14	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	2	57	4.97	194/1447	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.70	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	0	0	3	11	31	4.62	262/1434	4.13	3.97	4.10	3.97	4.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	7	51	4.88	245/1387	4.49	4.37	4.46	4.42	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	4	54	4.93	369/1387	4.74	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	8	50	4.86	182/1386	4.42	4.26	4.32	4.24	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	6	49	4.78	312/1380	4.45	4.23	4.32	4.30	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	1	0	0	10	45	4.75	131/1193	4.42	4.06	4.02	4.04	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	2	7	15	4.40	463/1172	3.79	4.02	4.15	4.12	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	38	0	0	0	4	5	16	4.48	570/1182	3.70	4.21	4.35	4.30	4.48
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	38	0	0	0	0	7	18	4.72	440/1170	4.12	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.72
4. Were special techniques successful	38	15	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	****/ 800	3.40	3.93	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	30	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	27						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	7	Under-grad	63	Non-major	43
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	20	F	0	Electives	11	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	9	15	16	3.98	1088/1447	4.40	4.29	4.31	4.31	3.98
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	10	14	14	3.84	1189/1447	4.37	4.13	4.27	4.23	3.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	10	9	19	3.91	989/1241	4.43	4.17	4.33	4.35	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	3	8	13	15	3.95	1026/1402	4.14	4.10	4.24	4.24	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	3	8	27	4.50	345/1358	4.36	4.19	4.11	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	5	4	4	10	17	3.75	997/1316	4.00	4.03	4.14	4.08	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	6	8	10	15	3.67	1201/1427	4.32	4.13	4.19	4.14	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	12	30	4.65	968/1447	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.70	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	2	0	12	14	4	3.56	1208/1434	4.13	3.97	4.10	3.97	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	4	1	6	13	18	3.95	1202/1387	4.49	4.37	4.46	4.42	3.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	3	1	2	7	29	4.38	1210/1387	4.74	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	5	1	7	12	17	3.83	1160/1386	4.42	4.26	4.32	4.24	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	5	5	6	21	3.85	1128/1380	4.45	4.23	4.32	4.30	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	3	3	4	15	17	3.95	705/1193	4.42	4.06	4.02	4.04	3.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	4	4	4	5	10	3.48	1004/1172	3.79	4.02	4.15	4.12	3.48
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	5	4	5	3	10	3.33	1113/1182	3.70	4.21	4.35	4.30	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	3	6	1	5	12	3.63	1025/1170	4.12	4.34	4.38	4.32	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	16	12	3	3	1	1	7	3.40	683/ 800	3.40	3.93	4.06	4.01	3.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 189	****	3.10	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 192	****	3.71	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 186	****	4.10	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 187	****	3.95	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	4.17	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 66	****	4.88	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 62	****	4.63	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 58	****	4.63	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 65	****	4.63	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 64	****	4.50	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: PSYC 285 02  
 Title Abnormal Psychology  
 Instructor: Arnheim, Daniel  
 Enrollment: 81  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1198  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	A	10	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	7	General	6	Under-grad	43	Non-major	38
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 285 03  
 Title Abnormal Psychology  
 Instructor: Resta, S P  
 Enrollment: 80  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1199  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	0	1	5	8	24	4.45	667/1447	4.40	4.29	4.31	4.31	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	1	2	7	28	4.63	389/1447	4.37	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	1	1	5	31	4.74	303/1241	4.43	4.17	4.33	4.35	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	6	1	3	5	11	12	3.94	1046/1402	4.14	4.10	4.24	4.24	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	3	0	6	5	8	16	3.97	834/1358	4.36	4.19	4.11	4.12	3.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	5	1	3	8	8	13	3.88	927/1316	4.00	4.03	4.14	4.08	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	3	7	27	4.65	301/1427	4.32	4.13	4.19	4.14	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	34	4	4.11	1332/1447	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.70	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	2	3	13	14	4.22	679/1434	4.13	3.97	4.10	3.97	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	12	25	4.63	611/1387	4.49	4.37	4.46	4.42	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	2	35	4.89	553/1387	4.74	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	3	11	24	4.55	558/1386	4.42	4.26	4.32	4.24	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	5	30	4.71	392/1380	4.45	4.23	4.32	4.30	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	1	4	6	27	4.55	256/1193	4.42	4.06	4.02	4.04	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	3	0	3	3	5	3.50	999/1172	3.79	4.02	4.15	4.12	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	4	1	2	1	6	3.29	1118/1182	3.70	4.21	4.35	4.30	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	2	0	2	2	8	4.00	864/1170	4.12	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	29	11	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 800	3.40	3.93	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	29	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	43	Non-major	33
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 305 01  
 Title The Exceptional Child  
 Instructor: Freiberg, Karen  
 Enrollment: 108  
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1200  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	8	11	27	4.36	761/1447	4.36	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	4	10	6	27	4.19	911/1447	4.19	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	5	10	27	4.26	774/1241	4.26	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.26	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	28	0	2	3	2	11	4.22	797/1402	4.22	4.10	4.24	4.24	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	2	9	10	23	4.16	700/1358	4.16	4.19	4.11	4.10	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	36	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	****/1316	****	4.03	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	4	3	6	33	4.48	500/1427	4.48	4.13	4.19	4.15	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	10	37	4.79	786/1447	4.79	4.70	4.69	4.65	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	0	2	8	12	11	3.97	902/1434	3.97	3.97	4.10	4.09	3.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	2	6	36	4.65	581/1387	4.65	4.37	4.46	4.44	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	8	37	4.78	814/1387	4.78	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	11	3	30	4.33	820/1386	4.33	4.26	4.32	4.30	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	7	7	29	4.33	823/1380	4.33	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	2	0	9	8	27	4.26	470/1193	4.26	4.06	4.02	4.05	4.26
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	3	8	2	14	3.89	806/1172	3.89	4.02	4.15	4.24	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	1	2	5	2	18	4.21	755/1182	4.21	4.21	4.35	4.42	4.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	1	1	4	5	17	4.29	745/1170	4.29	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	21	17	3	0	1	0	7	3.73	****/ 800	****	3.93	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	3.71	4.34	4.20	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	6	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	25
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	27						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	5	Under-grad	49	Non-major	24
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	11	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 306 01  
 Title Lifespan Human Develop  
 Instructor: Nail,Jennifer  
 Enrollment: 80  
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1201  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	1	5	20	24	4.27	849/1447	4.27	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	10	15	25	4.25	853/1447	4.25	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	2	6	17	26	4.31	734/1241	4.31	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	2	9	17	23	4.20	827/1402	4.20	4.10	4.24	4.24	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	3	22	22	4.18	681/1358	4.18	4.19	4.11	4.10	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	6	21	19	4.02	806/1316	4.02	4.03	4.14	4.13	4.02
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	8	19	21	4.12	906/1427	4.12	4.13	4.19	4.15	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	2	35	13	4.22	1275/1447	4.22	4.70	4.69	4.65	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	2	6	27	7	3.93	956/1434	3.93	3.97	4.10	4.09	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	4	15	31	4.54	741/1387	4.54	4.37	4.46	4.44	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	5	8	37	4.64	1006/1387	4.64	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	7	11	29	4.42	733/1386	4.42	4.26	4.32	4.30	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	6	15	25	4.29	849/1380	4.29	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	6	4	12	24	4.17	545/1193	4.17	4.06	4.02	4.05	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	4	1	11	9	3.88	812/1172	3.88	4.02	4.15	4.24	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	2	0	4	9	11	4.04	848/1182	4.04	4.21	4.35	4.42	4.04
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	0	1	5	5	15	4.31	733/1170	4.31	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.31
4. Were special techniques successful	29	7	0	3	4	2	9	3.94	476/ 800	3.94	3.93	4.06	4.12	3.94
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 189	****	3.10	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 192	****	3.71	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	52	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 186	****	4.10	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	52	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 187	****	3.95	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	52	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 168	****	4.17	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 66	****	4.88	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 62	****	4.63	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 58	****	4.63	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 65	****	4.63	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	4.50	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	52	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: PSYC 306 01  
 Title Lifespan Human Develop  
 Instructor: Nail, Jennifer  
 Enrollment: 80  
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1201  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	31	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	19						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	54	Non-major	49
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						



Course-Section: PSYC 307 01  
 Title Psychology Of Aging  
 Instructor: Freiberg, Karen  
 Enrollment: 116  
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1202  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	3	12	39	4.67	408/1447	4.67	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	4	15	34	4.57	468/1447	4.57	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	5	10	38	4.62	427/1241	4.62	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	20	0	0	6	6	19	4.42	603/1402	4.42	4.10	4.24	4.24	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	9	39	4.65	244/1358	4.65	4.19	4.11	4.10	4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	32	1	0	3	4	13	4.33	549/1316	4.33	4.03	4.14	4.13	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	1	7	45	4.83	133/1427	4.83	4.13	4.19	4.15	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	7	46	4.87	592/1447	4.87	4.70	4.69	4.65	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	1	1	1	20	20	4.33	553/1434	4.33	3.97	4.10	4.09	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	11	42	4.79	368/1387	4.79	4.37	4.46	4.44	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	4	49	4.92	422/1387	4.92	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	12	40	4.74	341/1386	4.74	4.26	4.32	4.30	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	8	44	4.77	312/1380	4.77	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	2	9	40	4.75	137/1193	4.75	4.06	4.02	4.05	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	5	6	15	4.26	580/1172	4.26	4.02	4.15	4.24	4.26
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	0	2	0	4	21	4.63	470/1182	4.63	4.21	4.35	4.42	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	275/1170	4.85	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	31	4	2	1	4	6	10	3.91	503/ 800	3.91	3.93	4.06	4.12	3.91

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 23						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	4	Under-grad	58	Non-major	39
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	4				
			? 1						

Course-Section: PSYC 308 01  
 Title Child Maltreatment  
 Instructor: Goldstein,Robin  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1203  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	32	4.86	190/1447	4.86	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	30	4.78	228/1447	4.78	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	24	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	380/1241	4.67	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	3	7	21	4.58	402/1402	4.58	4.10	4.24	4.24	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	2	31	4.77	158/1358	4.77	4.19	4.11	4.10	4.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	35	4.94	46/1316	4.94	4.03	4.14	4.13	4.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	1	4	29	4.71	237/1427	4.71	4.13	4.19	4.15	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	1	9	20	4.63	254/1434	4.63	3.97	4.10	4.09	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	31	4.81	353/1387	4.81	4.37	4.46	4.44	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	35	4.97	159/1387	4.97	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	31	4.86	182/1386	4.86	4.26	4.32	4.30	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	32	4.83	238/1380	4.83	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	1	3	4	21	4.43	349/1193	4.43	4.06	4.02	4.05	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	29	4.85	158/1172	4.85	4.02	4.15	4.24	4.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	2	29	4.82	292/1182	4.82	4.21	4.35	4.42	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	32	4.94	156/1170	4.94	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	0	3	1	6	15	4.32	296/ 800	4.32	3.93	4.06	4.12	4.32
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	****	3.71	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 186	****	4.10	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 187	****	3.95	4.33	4.11	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	4.50	4.09	3.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 25	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0	Major 24
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C 0	General 8	Under-grad 36	Non-major 12
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 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	3	6	7	4.25	869/1447	4.25	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	5	4.19	920/1447	4.19	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	5	5	3.81	1047/1241	3.81	4.17	4.33	4.33	3.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	891/1402	4.13	4.10	4.24	4.24	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	265/1358	4.63	4.19	4.11	4.10	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	9	3	3.80	968/1316	3.80	4.03	4.14	4.13	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	898/1427	4.13	4.13	4.19	4.15	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	1018/1447	4.60	4.70	4.69	4.65	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	9	2	3.93	956/1434	3.93	3.97	4.10	4.09	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	626/1387	4.63	4.37	4.46	4.44	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	1030/1387	4.63	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	0	4	10	4.38	775/1386	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.30	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	6	6	4.00	1030/1380	4.00	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	408/1193	4.36	4.06	4.02	4.05	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1031/1172	3.38	4.02	4.15	4.24	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1011/1182	3.75	4.21	4.35	4.42	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	763/1170	4.25	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	581/ 800	3.75	3.93	4.06	4.12	3.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 189	****	3.10	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 192	****	3.71	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 186	****	4.10	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 187	****	3.95	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 168	****	4.17	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 66	****	4.88	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 62	****	4.63	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.63	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.63	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 64	****	4.50	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: PSYC 317 01  
 Title Cognitive Psychology  
 Instructor: Groninger,Lowel  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1204  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	10
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 320 01  
 Title Psychological Assessme  
 Instructor: Anderson,Robert  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1205  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	22	4.79	276/1447	4.43	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	12	13	4.36	741/1447	4.33	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	9	11	4.15	855/1241	4.33	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	6	9	8	3.88	1088/1402	3.89	4.10	4.24	4.24	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	13	12	4.25	608/1358	4.29	4.19	4.11	4.10	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	5	10	9	3.85	939/1316	3.98	4.03	4.14	4.13	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	4	11	9	3.82	1130/1427	4.35	4.13	4.19	4.15	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	7	19	4.61	1018/1447	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.65	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	8	20	4.71	190/1434	4.45	3.97	4.10	4.09	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	414/1387	4.51	4.37	4.46	4.44	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	579/1387	4.78	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	206/1386	4.65	4.26	4.32	4.30	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	20	4.77	326/1380	4.49	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	3	6	16	4.42	358/1193	3.79	4.06	4.02	4.05	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	175/1172	4.44	4.02	4.15	4.24	4.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	198/1182	4.32	4.21	4.35	4.42	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	223/1170	4.64	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	17	3	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	150/ 800	4.63	3.93	4.06	4.12	4.63

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 0	Major 24
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 28	Non-major 4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 4			

Course-Section: PSYC 320 02  
 Title Psychological Assessme  
 Instructor: Rudow,Edward  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1206  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	0	1	7	5	11	4.08	1017/1447	4.43	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	1	3	7	12	4.30	805/1447	4.33	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	523/1241	4.33	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	13	1	1	0	5	4	3.91	1076/1402	3.89	4.10	4.24	4.24	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	3	6	14	4.33	529/1358	4.29	4.19	4.11	4.10	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	15	1	1	0	1	6	4.11	748/1316	3.98	4.03	4.14	4.13	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	106/1427	4.35	4.13	4.19	4.15	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1447	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	2	14	6	4.18	712/1434	4.45	3.97	4.10	4.09	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	0	3	8	12	4.25	1039/1387	4.51	4.37	4.46	4.44	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	982/1387	4.78	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	3	4	16	4.46	677/1386	4.65	4.26	4.32	4.30	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	1	9	11	4.22	924/1380	4.49	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	11	3	1	4	1	4	3.15	1062/1193	3.79	4.06	4.02	4.05	3.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	4	3	10	4.05	691/1172	4.44	4.02	4.15	4.24	4.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	2	3	4	8	3.74	1017/1182	4.32	4.21	4.35	4.42	3.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	4	1	13	4.37	687/1170	4.64	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.37
4. Were special techniques successful	13	11	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	****/ 800	4.63	3.93	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 192	****	3.71	4.34	4.20	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	16	Required for Majors		11	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General		2	Under-grad	31	Non-major	16
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives		6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: PSYC 324 01  
 Title Intro Interview Techn  
 Instructor: Glyshaw,Kathy J  
 Enrollment: 63  
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1207  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	1	6	15	15	3.95	1108/1447	3.95	4.29	4.31	4.32	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	6	6	15	9	3.47	1331/1447	3.48	4.13	4.27	4.23	3.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	33	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	****/1241	****	4.17	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	2	5	12	17	4.05	943/1402	4.05	4.10	4.24	4.24	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	4	12	19	4.07	761/1358	4.07	4.19	4.11	4.10	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	7	10	10	12	3.69	1032/1316	3.69	4.03	4.14	4.13	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	10	7	11	7	5	2.75	1378/1427	2.75	4.13	4.19	4.15	2.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	35	4.88	565/1447	4.88	4.70	4.69	4.65	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	2	2	11	11	7	3.58	1203/1434	3.58	3.97	4.10	4.09	3.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	4	6	16	7	4	3.03	1349/1387	3.03	4.37	4.46	4.44	3.03
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	7	28	4.70	934/1387	4.70	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	6	2	8	18	3	3.27	1296/1386	3.27	4.26	4.32	4.30	3.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	3	7	13	10	3.59	1220/1380	3.59	4.23	4.32	4.32	3.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	5	5	11	16	4.03	644/1193	4.03	4.06	4.02	4.05	4.03
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	2	2	5	11	4.10	675/1172	4.10	4.02	4.15	4.24	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	382/1182	4.71	4.21	4.35	4.42	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	2	0	1	3	15	4.38	672/1170	4.38	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	20	1	4	0	1	4	11	3.90	512/ 800	3.90	3.93	4.06	4.12	3.90
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	3.10	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	****	3.71	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.10	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	3.95	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	4.17	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.88	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.63	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.63	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.63	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	4.50	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: PSYC 324 01  
 Title Intro Interview Techn  
 Instructor: Glyshaw, Kathy J  
 Enrollment: 63  
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1207  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	29	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	37
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	41	Non-major	4
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	11	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						



Course-Section: PSYC 330 01  
 Title Child Devel And Cultur  
 Instructor: Cheah,Charissa  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1208  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	0	5	24	4.73	331/1447	4.73	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	5	24	4.73	270/1447	4.73	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	26	4.83	204/1241	4.83	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	2	9	17	4.54	459/1402	4.54	4.10	4.24	4.24	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	6	22	4.55	319/1358	4.55	4.19	4.11	4.10	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	9	18	4.35	534/1316	4.35	4.03	4.14	4.13	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	5	23	4.70	256/1427	4.70	4.13	4.19	4.15	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	592/1447	4.87	4.70	4.69	4.65	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	11	12	4.46	397/1434	4.46	3.97	4.10	4.09	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	27	4.87	245/1387	4.87	4.37	4.46	4.44	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	211/1387	4.97	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	28	4.87	171/1386	4.87	4.26	4.32	4.30	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	28	4.87	204/1380	4.87	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	0	1	4	22	4.52	281/1193	4.52	4.06	4.02	4.05	4.52
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	175/1172	4.81	4.02	4.15	4.24	4.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	410/1182	4.69	4.21	4.35	4.42	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	156/1170	4.94	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	279/ 800	4.36	3.93	4.06	4.12	4.36

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 13	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B 9					
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C 1	General	1	Under-grad	32	Non-major 16
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	0			
				? 0					

Course-Section: PSYC 331 01  
 Title Experimental Psych I  
 Instructor: Warwick forsyth  
 Enrollment: 94  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1209  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	0	2	14	15	4.31	810/1447	4.31	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	2	4	9	16	4.26	853/1447	4.26	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	11	17	4.45	599/1241	4.45	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	1	1	8	13	4.43	579/1402	4.43	4.10	4.24	4.24	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	4	13	11	3.94	881/1358	3.94	4.19	4.11	4.10	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	11	1	0	2	8	10	4.24	635/1316	4.24	4.03	4.14	4.13	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	9	21	4.56	385/1427	4.56	4.13	4.19	4.15	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	339/1447	4.94	4.70	4.69	4.65	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	1	8	11	4	3.64	1162/1434	3.64	3.97	4.10	4.09	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	1	6	23	4.61	641/1387	4.61	4.37	4.46	4.44	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	8	22	4.63	1030/1387	4.63	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	2	3	5	19	4.30	839/1386	4.30	4.26	4.32	4.30	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	4	0	7	19	4.26	887/1380	4.26	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	2	2	2	6	15	4.11	602/1193	4.11	4.06	4.02	4.05	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	3	4	13	4.33	521/1172	4.33	4.02	4.15	4.24	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	1	3	4	11	4.00	856/1182	4.00	4.21	4.35	4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	0	3	9	7	3.90	941/1170	3.90	4.34	4.38	4.49	3.90
4. Were special techniques successful	12	14	1	1	2	0	4	3.63	****/ 800	****	3.93	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 189	****	3.10	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 192	****	3.71	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 186	****	4.10	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 187	****	3.95	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 168	****	4.17	4.20	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	26
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	34	Non-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 332 01  
 Title Experimental Psych II  
 Instructor: Garrett, Adia J  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1210  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	7	14	4.32	800/1447	4.12	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	18	4.52	510/1447	3.92	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	0	4	17	4.28	758/1241	3.87	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	19	4.56	425/1402	4.25	4.10	4.24	4.24	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	4	9	7	3.60	1125/1358	3.80	4.19	4.11	4.10	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	2	19	4.52	372/1316	4.18	4.03	4.14	4.13	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	4	17	4.40	596/1427	4.19	4.13	4.19	4.15	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	565/1447	4.61	4.70	4.69	4.65	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	296/1434	3.71	3.97	4.10	4.09	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	881/1387	4.18	4.37	4.46	4.44	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	919/1387	4.22	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	1	0	2	16	4.55	558/1386	3.91	4.26	4.32	4.30	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	1	5	13	4.33	815/1380	3.79	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	1	3	5	10	4.10	612/1193	3.73	4.06	4.02	4.05	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	552/1172	3.80	4.02	4.15	4.24	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	578/1182	4.13	4.21	4.35	4.42	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	494/1170	4.37	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	3	1	5	6	3.93	485/ 800	3.68	3.93	4.06	4.12	3.93
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 189	3.10	3.10	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 192	3.71	3.71	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 186	4.10	4.10	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 187	3.95	3.95	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 168	4.17	4.17	4.20	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 332 05  
 Title Experimental Psych II  
 Instructor: Blass,Thomas (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1211  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	2	16	13	4.21	909/1447	4.12	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	12	9	10	3.82	1203/1447	3.92	4.13	4.27	4.23	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	7	11	11	3.85	1028/1241	3.87	4.17	4.33	4.33	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	9	17	4.21	807/1402	4.25	4.10	4.24	4.24	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	8	8	14	4.00	799/1358	3.80	4.19	4.11	4.10	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	2	11	16	4.19	681/1316	4.18	4.03	4.14	4.13	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	8	9	14	4.03	953/1427	4.19	4.13	4.19	4.15	4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	16	17	4.52	1072/1447	4.61	4.70	4.69	4.65	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	4	8	13	2	3.48	1245/1434	3.71	3.97	4.10	4.09	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	8	10	11	3.97	1196/1387	4.18	4.37	4.46	4.44	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	6	22	4.58	1072/1387	4.22	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.03
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	4	8	10	8	3.73	1198/1386	3.91	4.26	4.32	4.30	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	5	9	12	3.84	1138/1380	3.79	4.23	4.32	4.32	3.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	9	2	2	8	5	4	3.33	1022/1193	3.73	4.06	4.02	4.05	3.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	4	5	7	6	3.57	974/1172	3.80	4.02	4.15	4.24	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	5	5	12	4.17	781/1182	4.13	4.21	4.35	4.42	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	1	8	13	4.39	664/1170	4.37	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.39
4. Were special techniques successful	11	12	0	1	5	3	2	3.55	645/ 800	3.68	3.93	4.06	4.12	3.55

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 29	Graduate 0	Major 29
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 14			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 34	Non-major 5
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 2			

Course-Section: PSYC 332 05  
 Title Experimental Psych II  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1212  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	2	16	13	4.21	909/1447	4.12	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	12	9	10	3.82	1203/1447	3.92	4.13	4.27	4.23	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	7	11	11	3.85	1028/1241	3.87	4.17	4.33	4.33	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	9	17	4.21	807/1402	4.25	4.10	4.24	4.24	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	8	8	14	4.00	799/1358	3.80	4.19	4.11	4.10	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	2	11	16	4.19	681/1316	4.18	4.03	4.14	4.13	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	8	9	14	4.03	953/1427	4.19	4.13	4.19	4.15	4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	16	17	4.52	1072/1447	4.61	4.70	4.69	4.65	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	0	1	0	2	6	2	3.73	1110/1434	3.71	3.97	4.10	4.09	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	1	1	1	4	2	3.56	1300/1387	4.18	4.37	4.46	4.44	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	1	1	1	5	1	3.44	1366/1387	4.22	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.03
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	1	1	1	5	2	3.60	1237/1386	3.91	4.26	4.32	4.30	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	2	0	3	3	2	3.30	1291/1380	3.79	4.23	4.32	4.32	3.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	4	0	2	2	2	0	3.00	****/1193	3.73	4.06	4.02	4.05	3.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	4	5	7	6	3.57	974/1172	3.80	4.02	4.15	4.24	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	5	5	12	4.17	781/1182	4.13	4.21	4.35	4.42	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	1	8	13	4.39	664/1170	4.37	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.39
4. Were special techniques successful	11	12	0	1	5	3	2	3.55	645/ 800	3.68	3.93	4.06	4.12	3.55

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 29	Graduate 0	Major 29	
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 14				
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C 5	General	0	Under-grad 34	Non-major 5
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	6	D 0				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	0		
				? 2				

Course-Section: PSYC 332 05  
 Title Experimental Psych II  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1213  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	2	16	13	4.21	909/1447	4.12	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	12	9	10	3.82	1203/1447	3.92	4.13	4.27	4.23	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	7	11	11	3.85	1028/1241	3.87	4.17	4.33	4.33	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	9	17	4.21	807/1402	4.25	4.10	4.24	4.24	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	8	8	14	4.00	799/1358	3.80	4.19	4.11	4.10	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	2	11	16	4.19	681/1316	4.18	4.03	4.14	4.13	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	8	9	14	4.03	953/1427	4.19	4.13	4.19	4.15	4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	16	17	4.52	1072/1447	4.61	4.70	4.69	4.65	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	0	1	0	6	5	2	3.50	1238/1434	3.71	3.97	4.10	4.09	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	1039/1387	4.18	4.37	4.46	4.44	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	1	4	3	7	4.07	1309/1387	4.22	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.03
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	829/1386	3.91	4.26	4.32	4.30	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	4	0	1	4	7	3.63	1211/1380	3.79	4.23	4.32	4.32	3.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	6	3	1	1	2	2	2.89	1119/1193	3.73	4.06	4.02	4.05	3.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	4	5	7	6	3.57	974/1172	3.80	4.02	4.15	4.24	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	5	5	12	4.17	781/1182	4.13	4.21	4.35	4.42	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	1	8	13	4.39	664/1170	4.37	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.39
4. Were special techniques successful	11	12	0	1	5	3	2	3.55	645/ 800	3.68	3.93	4.06	4.12	3.55

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 29	Graduate 0	Major 29
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 14			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 34	Non-major 5
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 2			

Course-Section: PSYC 332 09  
 Title Experimental Psych II  
 Instructor: Groninger,Lowel  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1214  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	3	1	3	3.30	1373/1447	4.12	4.29	4.31	4.32	3.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	1	2	3.20	1378/1447	3.92	4.13	4.27	4.23	3.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	2	2	2	3.00	1215/1241	3.87	4.17	4.33	4.33	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	976/1402	4.25	4.10	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	2	0	4	3.10	1282/1358	3.80	4.19	4.11	4.10	3.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	3	4	3.70	1026/1316	4.18	4.03	4.14	4.13	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	1	5	3.90	1077/1427	4.19	4.13	4.19	4.15	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	1018/1447	4.61	4.70	4.69	4.65	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	4	2	0	3.00	1349/1434	3.71	3.97	4.10	4.09	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	1000/1387	4.18	4.37	4.46	4.44	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	1350/1387	4.22	4.72	4.73	4.71	3.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	4	1	2	3.20	1306/1386	3.91	4.26	4.32	4.30	3.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	0	5	2	3.40	1270/1380	3.79	4.23	4.32	4.32	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	1	0	5	3.88	775/1193	3.73	4.06	4.02	4.05	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	925/1172	3.80	4.02	4.15	4.24	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1037/1182	4.13	4.21	4.35	4.42	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	864/1170	4.37	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 800	3.68	3.93	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 189	3.10	3.10	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 192	3.71	3.71	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	4.10	4.10	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	3.95	3.95	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	4.17	4.17	4.20	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	8	Graduate 0 Major 9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 5			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0	Under-grad 10 Non-major 1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	0	
			? 0			

Course-Section: PSYC 332 13  
 Title Experimental Psych II  
 Instructor: Alonso,Diane L  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1215  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	5	5	17	4.44	667/1447	4.12	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	2	3	5	16	4.35	753/1447	3.92	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	3	7	16	4.37	683/1241	3.87	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	1	6	17	4.33	685/1402	4.25	4.10	4.24	4.24	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	1	2	8	12	4.08	756/1358	3.80	4.19	4.11	4.10	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	1	9	13	4.28	590/1316	4.18	4.03	4.14	4.13	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	191/1427	4.19	4.13	4.19	4.15	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	10	16	4.62	1008/1447	4.61	4.70	4.69	4.65	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	6	10	5	3.95	916/1434	3.71	3.97	4.10	4.09	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	9	16	4.58	698/1387	4.18	4.37	4.46	4.44	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	784/1387	4.22	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	4	4	5	13	4.04	1034/1386	3.91	4.26	4.32	4.30	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	4	6	14	4.23	905/1380	3.79	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	4	5	14	4.43	349/1193	3.73	4.06	4.02	4.05	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	2	5	10	4.16	643/1172	3.80	4.02	4.15	4.24	4.16
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	2	0	2	5	10	4.11	832/1182	4.13	4.21	4.35	4.42	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	640/1170	4.37	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	1	0	3	5	4	3.85	542/ 800	3.68	3.93	4.06	4.12	3.85
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	6	0	7	2	6	3.10	183/ 189	3.10	3.10	4.34	4.26	3.10
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	3	4	6	7	3.71	168/ 192	3.71	3.71	4.34	4.20	3.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	1	1	3	6	10	4.10	156/ 186	4.10	4.10	4.48	4.36	4.10
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	1	3	2	5	10	3.95	149/ 187	3.95	3.95	4.33	4.11	3.95
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	3	0	2	2	5	9	4.17	97/ 168	4.17	4.17	4.20	4.02	4.17
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 66	****	4.88	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.63	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	4.63	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 65	****	4.63	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 64	****	4.50	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****



Course-Section: PSYC 332 13  
 Title Experimental Psych II  
 Instructor: Alonso, Diane L  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1215  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 333 01  
 Title Laughter And Humor  
 Instructor: Provine,Robert  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1216  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	4	12	14	11	3.71	1273/1447	3.71	4.29	4.31	4.32	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	5	10	13	13	3.83	1196/1447	3.83	4.13	4.27	4.23	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	4	12	12	13	3.83	1041/1241	3.83	4.17	4.33	4.33	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	8	2	5	9	8	10	3.56	1245/1402	3.56	4.10	4.24	4.24	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	3	9	27	4.53	332/1358	4.53	4.19	4.11	4.10	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	7	7	9	13	5	3.05	1253/1316	3.05	4.03	4.14	4.13	3.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	1	2	8	29	4.54	422/1427	4.54	4.13	4.19	4.15	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	7	35	4.83	673/1447	4.83	4.70	4.69	4.65	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	2	1	12	17	8	3.70	1125/1434	3.70	3.97	4.10	4.09	3.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	12	16	12	3.95	1202/1387	3.95	4.37	4.46	4.44	3.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	3	6	31	4.63	1018/1387	4.63	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	2	10	15	11	3.85	1155/1386	3.85	4.26	4.32	4.30	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	14	12	11	3.68	1191/1380	3.68	4.23	4.32	4.32	3.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	6	5	7	9	13	3.45	979/1193	3.45	4.06	4.02	4.05	3.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	4	1	5	8	4	3.32	1047/1172	3.32	4.02	4.15	4.24	3.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	3	8	5	5	3.45	1092/1182	3.45	4.21	4.35	4.42	3.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	4	1	6	7	4	3.27	1114/1170	3.27	4.34	4.38	4.49	3.27
4. Were special techniques successful	23	18	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	****/ 800	****	3.93	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 192	****	3.71	4.34	4.20	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	10
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 14		Graduate
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	7
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	11
			P 1		
			I 0		
			? 3	Other	3
#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					

Course-Section: PSYC 335 01  
 Title Physiological Psycholo  
 Instructor: Warren, Kimberly  
 Enrollment: 170  
 Questionnaires: 90

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1217  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	5	6	23	25	25	3.70	1277/1447	3.70	4.29	4.31	4.32	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	1	8	17	26	32	3.95	1097/1447	3.95	4.13	4.27	4.23	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	1	5	12	21	45	4.24	798/1241	4.24	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	20	6	6	15	12	26	3.71	1188/1402	3.71	4.10	4.24	4.24	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	2	8	7	21	20	27	3.61	1118/1358	3.61	4.19	4.11	4.10	3.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	8	10	10	19	20	18	3.34	1200/1316	3.34	4.03	4.14	4.13	3.34
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	4	6	14	60	4.55	410/1427	4.55	4.13	4.19	4.15	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	2	0	0	1	5	76	4.91	436/1447	4.91	4.70	4.69	4.65	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	2	3	5	38	20	5	3.27	1310/1434	3.27	3.97	4.10	4.09	3.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	4	2	14	21	42	4.14	1118/1387	4.14	4.37	4.46	4.44	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	4	14	16	48	4.28	1252/1387	4.28	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	8	7	21	26	22	3.56	1247/1386	3.56	4.26	4.32	4.30	3.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	7	11	10	24	31	3.73	1175/1380	3.73	4.23	4.32	4.32	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	6	8	10	24	32	3.85	786/1193	3.85	4.06	4.02	4.05	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	65	0	7	3	5	4	6	2.96	1101/1172	2.96	4.02	4.15	4.24	2.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	65	0	7	3	9	0	6	2.80	1152/1182	2.80	4.21	4.35	4.42	2.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	64	0	4	3	8	5	6	3.23	1120/1170	3.23	4.34	4.38	4.49	3.23
4. Were special techniques successful	64	18	2	2	1	1	2	2.88	****/ 800	****	3.93	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	31	Required for Majors	59	Graduate	0	Major	55
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B	25						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	10	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	90	Non-major	35
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	14	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Course-Section: PSYC 340 01  
 Title Social Psychology  
 Instructor: Blass,Thomas  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1218  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	3	9	13	4.40	723/1447	4.40	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	2	6	8	9	3.96	1088/1447	3.96	4.13	4.27	4.23	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	1	4	9	10	4.04	905/1241	4.04	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	3	2	0	6	3	9	3.85	1107/1402	3.85	4.10	4.24	4.24	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	8	14	4.36	496/1358	4.36	4.19	4.11	4.10	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	15	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	812/1316	4.00	4.03	4.14	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	4	4	16	4.40	596/1427	4.40	4.13	4.19	4.15	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	8	17	4.68	948/1447	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.65	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	2	0	4	8	5	3.74	1103/1434	3.74	3.97	4.10	4.09	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	5	18	4.58	698/1387	4.58	4.37	4.46	4.44	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	579/1387	4.88	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	7	4	13	4.08	1018/1386	4.08	4.26	4.32	4.30	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	8	14	4.35	807/1380	4.35	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	7	4	11	3.96	705/1193	3.96	4.06	4.02	4.05	3.96
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	559/1172	4.29	4.02	4.15	4.24	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	803/1182	4.14	4.21	4.35	4.42	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	745/1170	4.29	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	14	8	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	****/ 800	****	3.93	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0	Major 17
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 12			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 6	General 2	Under-grad 28	Non-major 11
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PSYC 342 01  
 Title Psych Of Aggression  
 Instructor: Schultz,David A  
 Enrollment: 65  
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1219  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	1	7	18	28	4.23	889/1447	4.23	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	9	16	29	4.29	824/1447	4.29	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	2	6	14	32	4.29	758/1241	4.29	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	13	14	27	4.16	854/1402	4.16	4.10	4.24	4.24	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	6	20	28	4.36	496/1358	4.36	4.19	4.11	4.10	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	3	14	14	21	3.85	939/1316	3.85	4.03	4.14	4.13	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	7	16	31	4.40	596/1427	4.40	4.13	4.19	4.15	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	6	49	4.89	511/1447	4.89	4.70	4.69	4.65	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	3	12	23	13	3.85	1024/1434	3.85	3.97	4.10	4.09	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	3	6	12	33	4.33	980/1387	4.33	4.37	4.46	4.44	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	5	11	38	4.56	1090/1387	4.56	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	3	6	19	26	4.20	927/1386	4.20	4.26	4.32	4.30	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	3	10	9	29	4.02	1026/1380	4.02	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.02
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	2	9	14	28	4.22	501/1193	4.22	4.06	4.02	4.05	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	1	7	5	8	3.95	755/1172	3.95	4.02	4.15	4.24	3.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	37	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	508/1182	4.57	4.21	4.35	4.42	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	37	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	480/1170	4.67	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	37	4	2	0	5	3	7	3.76	577/ 800	3.76	3.93	4.06	4.12	3.76

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	30	Graduate	0	Major	42
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	33						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	9	C	4	General	3	Under-grad	58	Non-major	16
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	13	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 345 01  
 Title Intro Clinical Psych  
 Instructor: Anderson,Robert  
 Enrollment: 66  
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1220  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	5	10	42	4.65	430/1447	4.65	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	4	22	27	4.30	805/1447	4.30	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	6	12	36	4.42	634/1241	4.42	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	3	3	13	33	4.40	625/1402	4.40	4.10	4.24	4.24	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	7	10	39	4.53	332/1358	4.53	4.19	4.11	4.10	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	5	5	14	29	4.09	768/1316	4.09	4.03	4.14	4.13	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	5	8	11	31	4.12	898/1427	4.12	4.13	4.19	4.15	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	36	21	4.37	1182/1447	4.37	4.70	4.69	4.65	4.37
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	23	31	4.50	341/1434	4.50	3.97	4.10	4.09	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	20	32	4.53	769/1387	4.53	4.37	4.46	4.44	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	53	4.96	211/1387	4.96	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	14	36	4.55	568/1386	4.55	4.26	4.32	4.30	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	6	46	4.78	299/1380	4.78	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	2	4	6	16	18	3.96	705/1193	3.96	4.06	4.02	4.05	3.96
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	2	9	23	4.54	355/1172	4.54	4.02	4.15	4.24	4.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	1	2	3	29	4.71	382/1182	4.71	4.21	4.35	4.42	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	1	1	4	29	4.74	402/1170	4.74	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.74
4. Were special techniques successful	23	22	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	****/ 800	****	3.93	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 24	Graduate 0 Major 39
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 22		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 6	C 11	General 3	Under-grad 58 Non-major 19
84-150	14	3.00-3.49 12	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 20	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		

Course-Section: PSYC 346 01  
 Title Industrial Psychology  
 Instructor: Sigurdsson, Signu  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1221  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	9	25	4.69	386/1447	4.69	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	6	28	4.74	260/1447	4.74	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	10	24	4.63	427/1241	4.63	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	10	21	4.58	414/1402	4.58	4.10	4.24	4.24	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	29	4.77	158/1358	4.77	4.19	4.11	4.10	4.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	14	16	4.29	590/1316	4.29	4.03	4.14	4.13	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	10	25	4.71	237/1427	4.71	4.13	4.19	4.15	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	33	4.94	291/1447	4.94	4.70	4.69	4.65	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	3	0	0	1	10	18	4.59	290/1434	4.59	3.97	4.10	4.09	4.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	2	32	4.86	276/1387	4.86	4.37	4.46	4.44	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	33	4.94	317/1387	4.94	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	30	4.85	194/1386	4.85	4.26	4.32	4.30	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	32	4.86	216/1380	4.86	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	3	9	20	4.53	268/1193	4.53	4.06	4.02	4.05	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	302/1172	4.63	4.02	4.15	4.24	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	410/1182	4.68	4.21	4.35	4.42	4.68
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	352/1170	4.79	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	100/ 800	4.76	3.93	4.06	4.12	4.76

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 17	Graduate 0	Major 25
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 18			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 36	Non-major 11
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 9	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 1			

Course-Section: PSYC 356 01  
 Title Psyc Of Sex And Gender  
 Instructor: O'Brien,Eileen  
 Enrollment: 49  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1222  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	7	6	20	4.32	800/1447	4.32	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	7	23	4.56	479/1447	4.56	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	8	22	4.47	576/1241	4.47	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	4	8	19	4.33	685/1402	4.33	4.10	4.24	4.24	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	11	19	4.38	474/1358	4.38	4.19	4.11	4.10	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	4	10	16	4.32	557/1316	4.32	4.03	4.14	4.13	4.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	7	26	4.74	219/1427	4.74	4.13	4.19	4.15	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	6	26	4.71	918/1447	4.71	4.70	4.69	4.65	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	7	12	11	4.13	765/1434	4.13	3.97	4.10	4.09	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	28	4.82	337/1387	4.82	4.37	4.46	4.44	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	31	4.94	369/1387	4.94	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	5	25	4.67	431/1386	4.67	4.26	4.32	4.30	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	0	7	24	4.61	549/1380	4.61	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	8	23	4.64	205/1193	4.64	4.06	4.02	4.05	4.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	74/1172	4.94	4.02	4.15	4.24	4.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	219/1182	4.88	4.21	4.35	4.42	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	1	0	0	16	4.82	306/1170	4.82	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	18	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	313/ 800	4.29	3.93	4.06	4.12	4.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	35	Non-major	14
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	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	3	0	4	7	11	12	5	3.18	1392/1447	3.18	4.29	4.31	4.32	3.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	4	8	11	9	7	3.18	1381/1447	3.18	4.13	4.27	4.23	3.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	6	14	7	9	3.33	1175/1241	3.33	4.17	4.33	4.33	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	34	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/1402	****	4.10	4.24	4.24	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	7	4	15	9	2	2.86	1320/1358	2.86	4.19	4.11	4.10	2.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	34	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/1316	****	4.03	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	3	5	7	7	16	3.74	1172/1427	3.74	4.13	4.19	4.15	3.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	1	6	15	7	10	3.49	1433/1447	3.49	4.70	4.69	4.65	3.49
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	3	3	14	5	1	2.92	1374/1434	2.92	3.97	4.10	4.09	2.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	4	4	29	4.61	656/1387	4.61	4.37	4.46	4.44	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	5	14	20	4.38	1210/1387	4.38	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	7	10	11	7	3.32	1292/1386	3.32	4.26	4.32	4.30	3.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	6	8	12	9	3.41	1267/1380	3.41	4.23	4.32	4.32	3.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	8	1	5	5	6	11	3.75	843/1193	3.75	4.06	4.02	4.05	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	6	4	2	2	1	2.20	1163/1172	2.20	4.02	4.15	4.24	2.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	5	7	3	1	0	2.00	1178/1182	2.00	4.21	4.35	4.42	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	7	3	4	1	1	2.13	1167/1170	2.13	4.34	4.38	4.49	2.13
4. Were special techniques successful	26	15	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 800	****	3.93	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 192	****	3.71	4.34	4.20	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 66	****	4.88	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.63	4.56	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.63	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	4.50	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 23	Graduate 0	Major 21
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C 12	General 2	Under-grad 42	Non-major 21
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough	

P	1			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	2	
?	1			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	5	4	18	28	34	3.92	1138/1447	3.92	4.29	4.31	4.32	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	10	20	26	30	3.79	1217/1447	3.93	4.13	4.27	4.23	3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	5	20	28	34	3.98	942/1241	4.20	4.17	4.33	4.33	3.98
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	10	11	21	16	15	3.21	1343/1402	3.73	4.10	4.24	4.24	3.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	6	21	23	33	3.83	973/1358	4.25	4.19	4.11	4.10	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	23	17	23	15	8	2.63	1292/1316	3.31	4.03	4.14	4.13	2.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	17	8	60	4.42	568/1427	4.34	4.13	4.19	4.15	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	1	2	1	82	4.91	485/1447	4.45	4.70	4.69	4.65	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	5	7	25	25	21	3.60	1188/1434	3.57	3.97	4.10	4.09	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	11	15	20	40	3.97	1196/1387	3.77	4.37	4.46	4.44	3.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	11	15	60	4.51	1134/1387	4.38	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	10	7	22	29	20	3.48	1265/1386	3.49	4.26	4.32	4.30	3.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	7	5	14	23	37	3.91	1104/1380	4.16	4.23	4.32	4.32	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	3	8	17	29	25	3.79	819/1193	3.60	4.06	4.02	4.05	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	47	0	8	7	7	11	10	3.19	1070/1172	3.68	4.02	4.15	4.24	3.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	47	0	1	3	11	12	16	3.91	941/1182	4.23	4.21	4.35	4.42	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	47	0	3	1	11	10	18	3.91	941/1170	4.32	4.34	4.38	4.49	3.91
4. Were special techniques successful	47	37	2	1	1	0	2	2.83	****/ 800	4.14	3.93	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	85	2	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 189	****	3.10	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	85	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 192	****	3.71	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	85	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 186	****	4.10	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	86	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 187	****	3.95	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	86	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 168	****	4.17	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	85	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 66	****	4.88	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	86	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.63	4.56	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	86	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.63	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	86	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	4.50	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	86	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	86	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	86	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	86	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	87	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	86	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	86	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	86	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	86	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	86	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: PSYC 370 01  
 Title Sensation And Percepti  
 Instructor: Provine,Robert  
 Enrollment: 145  
 Questionnaires: 90

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1224  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	34	Required for Majors	62	Graduate	0	Major	62
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	32						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	7	C	14	General	5	Under-grad	90	Non-major	28
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	16	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 370 02  
 Title Sensation And Percepti  
 Instructor: Morakinyo,Sue E  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1225  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	1148/1447	3.92	4.29	4.31	4.32	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	1005/1447	3.93	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	646/1241	4.20	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	766/1402	3.73	4.10	4.24	4.24	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	237/1358	4.25	4.19	4.11	4.10	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	2	7	4.00	812/1316	3.31	4.03	4.14	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	775/1427	4.34	4.13	4.19	4.15	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	10	1	4.00	1361/1447	4.45	4.70	4.69	4.65	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	5	2	3	3.55	1218/1434	3.57	3.97	4.10	4.09	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	5	3	3	3.58	1298/1387	3.77	4.37	4.46	4.44	3.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	1260/1387	4.38	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	2	4	3	3.50	1258/1386	3.49	4.26	4.32	4.30	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	749/1380	4.16	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	4	1	3	3.40	999/1193	3.60	4.06	4.02	4.05	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	625/1172	3.68	4.02	4.15	4.24	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	527/1182	4.23	4.21	4.35	4.42	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	427/1170	4.32	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	389/ 800	4.14	3.93	4.06	4.12	4.14

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 380 01  
 Title Personality  
 Instructor: Anderson,Robert  
 Enrollment: 76  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1226  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	13	43	4.63	441/1447	4.71	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	16	38	4.52	521/1447	4.62	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	8	15	37	4.48	564/1241	4.66	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	2	5	12	11	24	3.93	1056/1402	4.26	4.10	4.24	4.24	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	5	18	32	4.33	540/1358	4.50	4.19	4.11	4.10	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	8	17	13	18	3.68	1038/1316	4.29	4.03	4.14	4.13	3.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	7	6	14	28	3.98	992/1427	4.46	4.13	4.19	4.15	3.98
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	43	15	4.24	1263/1447	4.62	4.70	4.69	4.65	4.24
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	22	36	4.57	303/1434	4.47	3.97	4.10	4.09	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	16	38	4.57	712/1387	4.68	4.37	4.46	4.44	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	6	51	4.86	630/1387	4.88	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	15	41	4.67	418/1386	4.78	4.26	4.32	4.30	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	7	48	4.81	273/1380	4.82	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	22	2	1	6	9	17	4.09	620/1193	4.15	4.06	4.02	4.05	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	35	0	1	0	3	7	14	4.32	529/1172	4.55	4.02	4.15	4.24	4.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	35	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	303/1182	4.72	4.21	4.35	4.42	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	35	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	440/1170	4.81	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.72
4. Were special techniques successful	35	18	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	****/ 800	4.75	3.93	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	3.71	4.34	4.20	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.88	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.63	4.56	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.63	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	4.50	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: PSYC 380 01  
 Title Personality  
 Instructor: Anderson,Robert  
 Enrollment: 76  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1226  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	23	Required for Majors	31	Graduate	0	Major	35
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	10	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	60	Non-major	25
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	13	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	13	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	2						

Course-Section: PSYC 380 02  
 Title Personality  
 Instructor: Rudow,Edward  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1227  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	276/1447	4.71	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	281/1447	4.62	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	195/1241	4.66	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	380/1402	4.26	4.10	4.24	4.24	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	237/1358	4.50	4.19	4.11	4.10	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	76/1316	4.29	4.03	4.14	4.13	4.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	52/1427	4.46	4.13	4.19	4.15	4.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1447	4.62	4.70	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	503/1434	4.47	3.97	4.10	4.09	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	383/1387	4.68	4.37	4.46	4.44	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	579/1387	4.88	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	147/1386	4.78	4.26	4.32	4.30	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	238/1380	4.82	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	509/1193	4.15	4.06	4.02	4.05	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	195/1172	4.55	4.02	4.15	4.24	4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	460/1182	4.72	4.21	4.35	4.42	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	233/1170	4.81	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	0	11	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	103/ 800	4.75	3.93	4.06	4.12	4.75
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	3.71	4.34	4.20	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	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	0				
				?	1						



Course-Section: PSYC 382 01  
 Title Child/Adol Psychopathl  
 Instructor: Dahlquist,Lynnnd  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1228  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	320/1447	4.59	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	20	4.74	260/1447	4.59	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	261/1241	4.61	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	4	19	4.56	437/1402	4.44	4.10	4.24	4.24	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	5	17	4.30	572/1358	4.09	4.19	4.11	4.10	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	18	4.57	322/1316	4.34	4.03	4.14	4.13	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	181/1427	4.64	4.13	4.19	4.15	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	3	24	4.79	786/1447	4.56	4.70	4.69	4.65	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	328/1434	4.18	3.97	4.10	4.09	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	80/1387	4.73	4.37	4.46	4.44	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	422/1387	4.78	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	55/1386	4.67	4.26	4.32	4.30	4.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	181/1380	4.63	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	3	5	18	4.58	243/1193	4.22	4.06	4.02	4.05	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	218/1172	4.59	4.02	4.15	4.24	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	138/1182	4.97	4.21	4.35	4.42	4.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	134/1170	4.54	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	12	12	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 800	3.40	3.93	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	3.10	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	3.71	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.10	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	3.95	4.33	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.88	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.63	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.63	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.63	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	4.50	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: PSYC 382 01  
 Title Child/Adol Psychopathl  
 Instructor: Dahlquist, Lynn  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1228  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 382 02  
 Title Child/Adol Psychopathl  
 Instructor: Martinez,Marian  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1229  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	667/1447	4.59	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	619/1447	4.59	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	611/1241	4.61	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	685/1402	4.44	4.10	4.24	4.24	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	931/1358	4.09	4.19	4.11	4.10	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	748/1316	4.34	4.03	4.14	4.13	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	459/1427	4.64	4.13	4.19	4.15	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1202/1447	4.56	4.70	4.69	4.65	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1031/1434	4.18	3.97	4.10	4.09	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	798/1387	4.73	4.37	4.46	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1030/1387	4.78	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	775/1386	4.67	4.26	4.32	4.30	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	783/1380	4.63	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	786/1193	4.22	4.06	4.02	4.05	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	445/1172	4.59	4.02	4.15	4.24	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1182	4.97	4.21	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	827/1170	4.54	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	683/ 800	3.40	3.93	4.06	4.12	3.40

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

Course-Section: PSYC 385 01  
 Title Health Psychology  
 Instructor: O'Brien,Eileen  
 Enrollment: 56  
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1230  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	0	3	17	13	4.21	919/1447	4.21	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	4	15	12	4.06	1023/1447	4.06	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	5	10	17	4.24	798/1241	4.24	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	3	5	10	14	4.09	916/1402	4.09	4.10	4.24	4.24	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	11	18	4.33	529/1358	4.33	4.19	4.11	4.10	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	3	6	11	13	4.03	795/1316	4.03	4.03	4.14	4.13	4.03
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	2	4	5	21	4.41	596/1427	4.41	4.13	4.19	4.15	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	6	27	4.82	727/1447	4.82	4.70	4.69	4.65	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	3	15	9	4.14	754/1434	4.14	3.97	4.10	4.09	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	10	20	4.53	755/1387	4.53	4.37	4.46	4.44	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	7	25	4.78	814/1387	4.78	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	11	18	4.44	705/1386	4.44	4.26	4.32	4.30	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	8	19	4.34	807/1380	4.34	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	1	0	6	4	19	4.33	420/1193	4.33	4.06	4.02	4.05	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	683/1172	4.07	4.02	4.15	4.24	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	2	1	1	10	4.36	676/1182	4.36	4.21	4.35	4.42	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	576/1170	4.50	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	22	1	0	2	3	3	5	3.85	542/ 800	3.85	3.93	4.06	4.12	3.85
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 189	****	3.10	4.34	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors		14	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11							
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General		4	Under-grad	36	Non-major	24
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	7	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives		7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		2				
				?	0							

Course-Section: PSYC 390 01  
 Title Neuropharmacology  
 Instructor: Rabin, B M  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1231  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	2	2	16	4.41	723/1447	4.20	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	1	10	8	3.95	1097/1447	4.14	4.13	4.27	4.23	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	0	8	9	3.86	1015/1241	3.57	4.17	4.33	4.33	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	19	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1402	4.00	4.10	4.24	4.24	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	2	2	8	7	3.76	1015/1358	3.81	4.19	4.11	4.10	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	2	3	15	4.32	704/1427	4.02	4.13	4.19	4.15	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	10	8	3	3.67	1426/1447	4.26	4.70	4.69	4.65	3.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	2	2	10	3	3.67	1150/1434	3.62	3.97	4.10	4.09	3.67
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	611/1387	4.68	4.37	4.46	4.44	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	2	3	15	4.36	1218/1387	4.68	4.72	4.73	4.71	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	2	6	11	4.05	1030/1386	4.17	4.26	4.32	4.30	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	1	2	16	4.27	868/1380	4.56	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	4	1	2	2	10	3.68	884/1193	3.77	4.06	4.02	4.05	3.68
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	3	2	1	3	3.20	1067/1172	2.60	4.02	4.15	4.24	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	1053/1182	2.72	4.21	4.35	4.42	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	0	2	2	4	3.60	1032/1170	3.20	4.34	4.38	4.49	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	13	9	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 800	****	3.93	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 390 02  
 Title Neuropharmacology  
 Instructor: Lynch, Minda R  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1232  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1058/1447	4.20	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	766/1447	4.14	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1182/1241	3.57	4.17	4.33	4.33	3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	976/1402	4.00	4.10	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	952/1358	3.81	4.19	4.11	4.10	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	700/1316	4.17	4.03	4.14	4.13	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	1180/1427	4.02	4.13	4.19	4.15	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	619/1447	4.26	4.70	4.69	4.65	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	5	0	2	3.57	1203/1434	3.62	3.97	4.10	4.09	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	490/1387	4.68	4.37	4.46	4.44	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	4.68	4.72	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	855/1386	4.17	4.26	4.32	4.30	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	216/1380	4.56	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	786/1193	3.77	4.06	4.02	4.05	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	0	0	2	0	2.00	1165/1172	2.60	4.02	4.15	4.24	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	4	1	0	0	1	1.83	1182/1182	2.72	4.21	4.35	4.42	1.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	0	0	2	2.80	1151/1170	3.20	4.34	4.38	4.49	2.80

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 406 01  
 Title Adv Behavior Pathology  
 Instructor: Neemann,Jennife  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1233  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1058/1447	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1189/1447	3.83	4.13	4.27	4.31	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1034/1241	3.83	4.17	4.33	4.41	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1264/1402	3.50	4.10	4.24	4.34	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	690/1358	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.15	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	700/1316	4.17	4.03	4.14	4.27	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	971/1427	4.00	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1202/1447	4.33	4.70	4.69	4.72	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1150/1434	3.67	3.97	4.10	4.17	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1176/1387	4.00	4.37	4.46	4.48	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	707/1387	4.83	4.72	4.73	4.76	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1220/1386	3.67	4.26	4.32	4.34	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	815/1380	4.33	4.23	4.32	4.34	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1193	****	4.06	4.02	4.00	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	521/1172	4.33	4.02	4.15	4.25	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	788/1182	4.17	4.21	4.35	4.49	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.34	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	290/ 800	4.33	3.93	4.06	4.19	4.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 407 01  
 Title Adv Child Psychology  
 Instructor: Sonnenschein,Su  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1234  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	1	3	4	8	5	3.62	1306/1447	3.62	4.29	4.31	4.43	3.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	2	3	9	6	1	3.05	1396/1447	3.05	4.13	4.27	4.31	3.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	1	8	6	5	3.62	1112/1241	3.62	4.17	4.33	4.41	3.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	2	2	6	8	3	3.38	1292/1402	3.38	4.10	4.24	4.34	3.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	5	5	7	3.62	1118/1358	3.62	4.19	4.11	4.15	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	2	3	6	6	3.38	1180/1316	3.38	4.03	4.14	4.27	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	3	5	5	7	3.67	1201/1427	3.67	4.13	4.19	4.20	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	485/1447	4.90	4.70	4.69	4.72	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	2	8	2	1	3.00	1349/1434	3.00	3.97	4.10	4.17	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	4	5	10	4.10	1147/1387	4.10	4.37	4.46	4.48	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	4	4	12	4.24	1268/1387	4.24	4.72	4.73	4.76	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	0	8	4	6	3.60	1237/1386	3.60	4.26	4.32	4.34	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	3	3	6	6	3.55	1232/1380	3.55	4.23	4.32	4.34	3.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	3	2	3	2	5	3.27	1039/1193	3.27	4.06	4.02	4.00	3.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	660/1172	4.13	4.02	4.15	4.25	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	817/1182	4.13	4.21	4.35	4.49	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	1025/1170	3.63	4.34	4.38	4.51	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	318/ 800	4.29	3.93	4.06	4.19	4.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 13	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major 8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D 1					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	0			
				? 1					



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	4	1	11	4.24	889/1447	4.24	4.29	4.31	4.43	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	1	13	4.47	575/1447	4.47	4.13	4.27	4.31	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1241	****	4.17	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	1	3	11	4.44	579/1402	4.44	4.10	4.24	4.34	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	97/1358	4.88	4.19	4.11	4.15	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	117/1316	4.82	4.03	4.14	4.27	4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	1	13	4.41	582/1427	4.41	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	744/1434	4.15	3.97	4.10	4.17	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	2	1	12	4.29	1007/1387	4.29	4.37	4.46	4.48	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	303/1386	4.76	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	0	15	4.71	406/1380	4.71	4.23	4.32	4.34	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	478/1193	4.25	4.06	4.02	4.00	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	1	13	4.56	344/1172	4.56	4.02	4.15	4.25	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	0	2	11	4.33	691/1182	4.33	4.21	4.35	4.49	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	0	14	4.80	327/1170	4.80	4.34	4.38	4.51	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	423/ 800	4.00	3.93	4.06	4.19	4.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 192	****	3.71	4.34	4.61	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.80	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.60	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 18	Non-major 4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PSYC 437 01  
 Title Making A Difference  
 Instructor: Maton,Kenneth  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1236  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	626/1447	4.48	4.29	4.31	4.43	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	14	4.48	575/1447	4.48	4.13	4.27	4.31	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.17	4.33	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	314/1402	4.67	4.10	4.24	4.34	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.19	4.11	4.15	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	455/1316	4.45	4.03	4.14	4.27	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	541/1427	4.45	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	901/1447	4.71	4.70	4.69	4.72	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	5	4	10	4.26	623/1434	4.26	3.97	4.10	4.17	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	656/1387	4.60	4.37	4.46	4.48	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	3	14	4.55	558/1386	4.55	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	4	14	4.50	659/1380	4.50	4.23	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	0	2	4	0	2	3.25	1041/1193	3.25	4.06	4.02	4.00	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	268/1172	4.69	4.02	4.15	4.25	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.21	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	466/1170	4.69	4.34	4.38	4.51	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	308/ 800	4.31	3.93	4.06	4.19	4.31
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	27/ 66	4.88	4.88	4.58	4.87	4.88
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	42/ 62	4.63	4.63	4.56	4.80	4.63
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	29/ 58	4.63	4.63	4.41	4.59	4.63
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	33/ 65	4.63	4.63	4.42	4.55	4.63
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	23/ 64	4.50	4.50	4.09	4.43	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	Graduate	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 9			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	Under-grad	6
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives		
			P 0			
			I 0	Other		
			? 0			

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

Course-Section: PSYC 493 01  
 Title Advanced Topics In Psy  
 Instructor: Resta, S P  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1237  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	4.83	4.29	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	532/1447	4.50	4.13	4.27	4.31	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1241	4.92	4.17	4.33	4.41	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	766/1402	4.60	4.10	4.24	4.34	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1358	4.28	4.19	4.11	4.15	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	549/1316	4.53	4.03	4.14	4.27	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	775/1427	4.33	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.60	4.70	4.69	4.72	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	341/1434	4.40	3.97	4.10	4.17	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	798/1387	4.63	4.37	4.46	4.48	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	4.94	4.72	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	316/1386	4.44	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1380	4.67	4.23	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	478/1193	4.49	4.06	4.02	4.00	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	282/1172	4.81	4.02	4.15	4.25	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	691/1182	4.53	4.21	4.35	4.49	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	480/1170	4.64	4.34	4.38	4.51	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	3.88	3.93	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 493 03  
 Title Advanced Topics In Psy  
 Instructor: Pitts, Steven C  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1238  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	452/1447	4.83	4.29	4.31	4.43	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	974/1447	4.50	4.13	4.27	4.31	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1241	4.92	4.17	4.33	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	129/1402	4.60	4.10	4.24	4.34	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1111/1358	4.28	4.19	4.11	4.15	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	617/1316	4.53	4.03	4.14	4.27	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	775/1427	4.33	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	565/1447	4.60	4.70	4.69	4.72	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	849/1434	4.40	3.97	4.10	4.17	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	931/1387	4.63	4.37	4.46	4.48	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	604/1387	4.94	4.72	4.73	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1231/1386	4.44	4.26	4.32	4.34	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1030/1380	4.67	4.23	4.32	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	288/1193	4.49	4.06	4.02	4.00	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	218/1172	4.81	4.02	4.15	4.25	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	737/1182	4.53	4.21	4.35	4.49	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	763/1170	4.64	4.34	4.38	4.51	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	655/ 800	3.88	3.93	4.06	4.19	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 493 04  
 Title Advanced Topics In Psy  
 Instructor: Schiffman,Jason  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1239  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	179/1447	4.83	4.29	4.31	4.43	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	137/1447	4.50	4.13	4.27	4.31	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1241	4.92	4.17	4.33	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	292/1402	4.60	4.10	4.24	4.34	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	61/1358	4.28	4.19	4.11	4.15	4.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1316	4.53	4.03	4.14	4.27	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	459/1427	4.33	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	339/1447	4.60	4.70	4.69	4.72	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	206/1434	4.40	3.97	4.10	4.17	4.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1387	4.63	4.37	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	369/1387	4.94	4.72	4.73	4.76	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	95/1386	4.44	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1380	4.67	4.23	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	143/1193	4.49	4.06	4.02	4.00	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1172	4.81	4.02	4.15	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1182	4.53	4.21	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1170	4.64	4.34	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	335/ 800	3.88	3.93	4.06	4.19	4.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0	Major 12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 16	Non-major 4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
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 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: PSYC 601 01  
 Title Special Topics In Psyc  
 Instructor: Bediako, Shawn M  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1240  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	4	8	4.11	998/1447	4.03	4.29	4.31	4.46	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	6	6	3.89	1154/1447	3.60	4.13	4.27	4.30	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	872/1241	3.39	4.17	4.33	4.38	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	6	3	3	3.43	1281/1402	3.51	4.10	4.24	4.29	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	9	7	4.11	736/1358	4.00	4.19	4.11	4.26	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	5	8	1	3.44	1160/1316	3.77	4.03	4.14	4.34	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	3	2	5	2	4	3.13	1354/1427	3.21	4.13	4.19	4.25	3.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	803/1447	4.76	4.70	4.69	4.74	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	7	7	2	3.59	1198/1434	3.63	3.97	4.10	4.21	3.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	3	12	4.39	921/1387	3.78	4.37	4.46	4.51	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	1	13	4.50	1143/1387	4.78	4.72	4.73	4.81	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	1	7	7	3.94	1095/1386	3.89	4.26	4.32	4.43	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	4	10	4.11	990/1380	3.76	4.23	4.32	4.38	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	6	4	5	3.81	807/1193	3.55	4.06	4.02	4.02	3.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	5	6	3.67	925/1172	3.80	4.02	4.15	4.32	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	4	1	13	4.50	553/1182	4.34	4.21	4.35	4.46	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	3	14	4.67	480/1170	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.52	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	10	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	398/ 800	3.86	3.93	4.06	4.10	4.13
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.88	4.58	4.71	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.63	4.41	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.63	4.42	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 64	****	4.50	4.09	4.18	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	17
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 3	Other	0

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601 02  
 Title Special Topics In Psyc  
 Instructor: Diclemente,Carl  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1241  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	5	7	4.12	998/1447	4.03	4.29	4.31	4.46	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	8	5	3.88	1154/1447	3.60	4.13	4.27	4.30	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	923/1241	3.39	4.17	4.33	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	1	3	4	2	3.25	1330/1402	3.51	4.10	4.24	4.29	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	9	6	4.12	736/1358	4.00	4.19	4.11	4.26	4.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	6	5	2	3.47	1149/1316	3.77	4.03	4.14	4.34	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	3	2	5	2	3	3.00	1359/1427	3.21	4.13	4.19	4.25	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	819/1447	4.76	4.70	4.69	4.74	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	9	3	3.94	942/1434	3.63	3.97	4.10	4.21	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	322/1387	3.78	4.37	4.46	4.51	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	844/1387	4.78	4.72	4.73	4.81	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	457/1386	3.89	4.26	4.32	4.43	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	749/1380	3.76	4.23	4.32	4.38	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	8	3	4	3.63	916/1193	3.55	4.06	4.02	4.02	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	5	3	5	3.56	974/1172	3.80	4.02	4.15	4.32	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	774/1182	4.34	4.21	4.35	4.46	4.19
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	2	1	4	9	4.25	763/1170	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.52	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	1	10	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	290/ 800	3.86	3.93	4.06	4.10	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	4.88	4.58	4.71	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.63	4.41	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.63	4.42	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 64	****	4.50	4.09	4.18	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 3	Other	0
#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					

Course-Section: PSYC 601 03  
 Title Special Topics In Psyc  
 Instructor: Glyshaw, Kathy J  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1242  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	3	1	3.50	1339/1447	4.03	4.29	4.31	4.46	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	3.00	1400/1447	3.60	4.13	4.27	4.30	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	2	0	2.67	1387/1402	3.51	4.10	4.24	4.29	2.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1270/1358	4.00	4.19	4.11	4.26	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	1	0	2.33	1306/1316	3.77	4.03	4.14	4.34	2.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1388/1427	3.21	4.13	4.19	4.25	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1447	4.76	4.70	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	2	1	3	0	0	2.17	1420/1434	3.63	3.97	4.10	4.21	2.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	2.00	1383/1387	3.78	4.37	4.46	4.51	2.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	707/1387	4.78	4.72	4.73	4.81	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	4	0	3.50	1258/1386	3.89	4.26	4.32	4.43	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	2	0	2.67	1346/1380	3.76	4.23	4.32	4.38	2.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	1022/1193	3.55	4.06	4.02	4.02	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	1131/1172	3.80	4.02	4.15	4.32	2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	996/1182	4.34	4.21	4.35	4.46	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	798/1170	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.52	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	103/ 800	3.86	3.93	4.06	4.10	4.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors		5	Graduate	3	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	3	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0							
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives		1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							



Course-Section: PSYC 601 04  
 Title Special Topics In Psyc  
 Instructor: Catania,Charles  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1243  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	0	3	3	2	3.09	1402/1447	4.03	4.29	4.31	4.46	3.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	6	3	1	0	2.36	1437/1447	3.60	4.13	4.27	4.30	2.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	5	2	2	0	2.36	1234/1241	3.39	4.17	4.33	4.38	2.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	2	0	2.64	1388/1402	3.51	4.10	4.24	4.29	2.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	3	3	3.64	1104/1358	4.00	4.19	4.11	4.26	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	4	1	3.36	1188/1316	3.77	4.03	4.14	4.34	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	8	1	1	0	0	1.30	1426/1427	3.21	4.13	4.19	4.25	1.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	727/1447	4.76	4.70	4.69	4.74	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	3	1	1	3	3.22	1320/1434	3.63	3.97	4.10	4.21	3.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	5	1	5	0	0	2.00	1383/1387	3.78	4.37	4.46	4.51	2.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	758/1387	4.78	4.72	4.73	4.81	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	2	3	2	0	2.27	1375/1386	3.89	4.26	4.32	4.43	2.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	2	2	1	2.55	1355/1380	3.76	4.23	4.32	4.38	2.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	2	1	3	1	0	2.43	1164/1193	3.55	4.06	4.02	4.02	2.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	2	1	2.80	1131/1172	3.80	4.02	4.15	4.32	2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	5	2	2	3.50	1078/1182	4.34	4.21	4.35	4.46	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	2	5	1	1	2.90	1142/1170	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.52	2.90
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	742/ 800	3.86	3.93	4.06	4.10	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601 05  
 Title Special Topics In Psyc  
 Instructor: Dunleavy, Eric M  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1244  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	201/1447	4.03	4.29	4.31	4.46	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	7	10	4.25	853/1447	3.60	4.13	4.27	4.30	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	700/1241	3.39	4.17	4.33	4.38	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	3	5	9	4.00	976/1402	3.51	4.10	4.24	4.29	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	507/1358	4.00	4.19	4.11	4.26	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	2	1	7	7	4.12	748/1316	3.77	4.03	4.14	4.34	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	4	1	3	5	6	3.42	1284/1427	3.21	4.13	4.19	4.25	3.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	836/1447	4.76	4.70	4.69	4.74	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	849/1434	3.63	3.97	4.10	4.21	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	656/1387	3.78	4.37	4.46	4.51	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1387	4.78	4.72	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	793/1386	3.89	4.26	4.32	4.43	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	16	4.60	549/1380	3.76	4.23	4.32	4.38	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	2	3	1	9	3.94	726/1193	3.55	4.06	4.02	4.02	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	4	12	4.25	580/1172	3.80	4.02	4.15	4.32	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	0	3	15	4.50	553/1182	4.34	4.21	4.35	4.46	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	352/1170	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.52	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	2	0	1	5	7	4.00	423/ 800	3.86	3.93	4.06	4.10	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 1	A 11	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 8 Major 18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 13 Non-major 3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 601 06  
 Title Special Topics In Psyc  
 Instructor: Griffith,James  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1245  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1411/1447	4.03	4.29	4.31	4.46	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1438/1447	3.60	4.13	4.27	4.30	2.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1241/1241	3.39	4.17	4.33	4.38	1.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1399/1402	3.51	4.10	4.24	4.29	2.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1291/1358	4.00	4.19	4.11	4.26	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1050/1316	3.77	4.03	4.14	4.34	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1418/1427	3.21	4.13	4.19	4.25	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	4.76	4.70	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1395/1434	3.63	3.97	4.10	4.21	2.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1369/1387	3.78	4.37	4.46	4.51	2.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	4.78	4.72	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1357/1386	3.89	4.26	4.32	4.43	2.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1346/1380	3.76	4.23	4.32	4.38	2.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1087/1193	3.55	4.06	4.02	4.02	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1090/1172	3.80	4.02	4.15	4.32	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1078/1182	4.34	4.21	4.35	4.46	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	864/1170	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.52	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	742/ 800	3.86	3.93	4.06	4.10	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601 07  
 Title Special Topics In Psyc  
 Instructor: Lasson, Elliot D  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1246  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	869/1447	4.03	4.29	4.31	4.46	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1228/1447	3.60	4.13	4.27	4.30	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1068/1241	3.39	4.17	4.33	4.38	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	891/1402	3.51	4.10	4.24	4.29	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	727/1358	4.00	4.19	4.11	4.26	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	392/1316	3.77	4.03	4.14	4.34	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	200/1427	3.21	4.13	4.19	4.25	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	565/1447	4.76	4.70	4.69	4.74	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1238/1434	3.63	3.97	4.10	4.21	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	1131/1387	3.78	4.37	4.46	4.51	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	859/1387	4.78	4.72	4.73	4.81	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1047/1386	3.89	4.26	4.32	4.43	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	984/1380	3.76	4.23	4.32	4.38	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	895/1193	3.55	4.06	4.02	4.02	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	710/1172	3.80	4.02	4.15	4.32	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	508/1182	4.34	4.21	4.35	4.46	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	745/1170	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.52	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	777/ 800	3.86	3.93	4.06	4.10	2.67
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.77	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601 08  
 Title Special Topics In Psyc  
 Instructor: Milatzo, John P  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1247  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	4.03	4.29	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	766/1447	3.60	4.13	4.27	4.30	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	3.39	4.17	4.33	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1402	3.51	4.10	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	345/1358	4.00	4.19	4.11	4.26	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	166/1316	3.77	4.03	4.14	4.34	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	200/1427	3.21	4.13	4.19	4.25	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	4.76	4.70	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	341/1434	3.63	3.97	4.10	4.21	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	798/1387	3.78	4.37	4.46	4.51	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	859/1387	4.78	4.72	4.73	4.81	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	316/1386	3.89	4.26	4.32	4.43	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	887/1380	3.76	4.23	4.32	4.38	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	895/1193	3.55	4.06	4.02	4.02	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1172	3.80	4.02	4.15	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1182	4.34	4.21	4.35	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1170	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	335/ 800	3.86	3.93	4.06	4.10	4.25

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601 09  
 Title Special Topics In Psyc  
 Instructor: Solomon,Janet S  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1248  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1198/1447	4.03	4.29	4.31	4.46	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1053/1447	3.60	4.13	4.27	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1143/1241	3.39	4.17	4.33	4.38	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1107/1402	3.51	4.10	4.24	4.29	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	690/1358	4.00	4.19	4.11	4.26	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	939/1316	3.77	4.03	4.14	4.34	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1237/1427	3.21	4.13	4.19	4.25	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1234/1447	4.76	4.70	4.69	4.74	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	454/1434	3.63	3.97	4.10	4.21	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	1015/1387	3.78	4.37	4.46	4.51	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	1191/1387	4.78	4.72	4.73	4.81	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1047/1386	3.89	4.26	4.32	4.43	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1030/1380	3.76	4.23	4.32	4.38	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	960/1193	3.55	4.06	4.02	4.02	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	521/1172	3.80	4.02	4.15	4.32	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	271/1182	4.34	4.21	4.35	4.46	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	480/1170	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.52	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	423/ 800	3.86	3.93	4.06	4.10	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601 11  
 Title Special Topics In Psyc  
 Instructor: Waldstein,Shari  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1249  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	585/1447	4.03	4.29	4.31	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	938/1447	3.60	4.13	4.27	4.30	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	923/1241	3.39	4.17	4.33	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	854/1402	3.51	4.10	4.24	4.29	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	122/1358	4.00	4.19	4.11	4.26	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	700/1316	3.77	4.03	4.14	4.34	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1259/1427	3.21	4.13	4.19	4.25	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1202/1447	4.76	4.70	4.69	4.74	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	540/1434	3.63	3.97	4.10	4.21	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	902/1387	3.78	4.37	4.46	4.51	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	4.78	4.72	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	253/1386	3.89	4.26	4.32	4.43	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	887/1380	3.76	4.23	4.32	4.38	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	288/1193	3.55	4.06	4.02	4.02	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	323/1172	3.80	4.02	4.15	4.32	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1182	4.34	4.21	4.35	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	327/1170	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.52	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	195/ 800	3.86	3.93	4.06	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 5	Graduate 2	Major 0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 4	Non-major 6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0				
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	0		
				? 0				

Course-Section: PSYC 607 01  
 Title Dev Psychopathology  
 Instructor: Schiffman,Jason  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1250  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	179/1447	4.88	4.29	4.31	4.46	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	137/1447	4.88	4.13	4.27	4.30	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	427/1241	4.63	4.17	4.33	4.38	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	217/1402	4.75	4.10	4.24	4.29	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.19	4.11	4.26	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	519/1316	4.38	4.03	4.14	4.34	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	971/1427	4.00	4.13	4.19	4.25	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	565/1447	4.88	4.70	4.69	4.74	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	262/1434	4.63	3.97	4.10	4.21	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	626/1387	4.63	4.37	4.46	4.51	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	604/1387	4.88	4.72	4.73	4.81	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	194/1386	4.86	4.26	4.32	4.43	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	193/1380	4.88	4.23	4.32	4.38	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	155/1193	4.71	4.06	4.02	4.02	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	152/1172	4.86	4.02	4.15	4.32	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	229/1182	4.88	4.21	4.35	4.46	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	275/1170	4.86	4.34	4.38	4.52	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	195/ 800	4.50	3.93	4.06	4.10	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: PSYC 608 01  
 Title Hum Div Rsrch & Interv  
 Instructor: Brodsky, Anne E  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1251  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	4	4	3.77	1253/1447	3.77	4.29	4.31	4.46	3.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	3	4	3.54	1311/1447	3.54	4.13	4.27	4.30	3.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	451/1241	4.60	4.17	4.33	4.38	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	2	3	3	3.33	1307/1402	3.33	4.10	4.24	4.29	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	2	7	4.08	761/1358	4.08	4.19	4.11	4.26	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	5	3	3.69	1032/1316	3.69	4.03	4.14	4.34	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	1	3	5	3.54	1249/1427	3.54	4.13	4.19	4.25	3.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	646/1447	4.85	4.70	4.69	4.74	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	4	5	0	3.30	1300/1434	3.30	3.97	4.10	4.21	3.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	1055/1387	4.23	4.37	4.46	4.51	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	946/1387	4.69	4.72	4.73	4.81	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1047/1386	4.00	4.26	4.32	4.43	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	5	3	3.62	1214/1380	3.62	4.23	4.32	4.38	3.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	4	0	4	4.00	652/1193	4.00	4.06	4.02	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	411/1172	4.46	4.02	4.15	4.32	4.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	3	0	5	5	3.92	924/1182	3.92	4.21	4.35	4.46	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	3	0	2	4	4	3.46	1082/1170	3.46	4.34	4.38	4.52	3.46
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	366/ 800	4.20	3.93	4.06	4.10	4.20
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 66	****	4.88	4.58	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 62	****	4.63	4.56	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.63	4.41	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.63	4.42	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 64	****	4.50	4.09	4.18	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 616 01  
 Title Meas Appl Behav An  
 Instructor: Borrero,John C  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1252  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	408/1447	4.67	4.29	4.31	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	170/1447	4.83	4.13	4.27	4.30	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	427/1241	4.63	4.17	4.33	4.38	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	217/1402	4.75	4.10	4.24	4.29	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	173/1358	4.75	4.19	4.11	4.26	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	312/1316	4.58	4.03	4.14	4.34	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	200/1427	4.75	4.13	4.19	4.25	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	836/1447	4.75	4.70	4.69	4.74	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	117/1434	4.80	3.97	4.10	4.21	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	180/1387	4.92	4.37	4.46	4.51	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	122/1386	4.92	4.26	4.32	4.43	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	143/1380	4.92	4.23	4.32	4.38	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	440/1193	4.30	4.06	4.02	4.02	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	454/1172	4.42	4.02	4.15	4.32	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	430/1182	4.67	4.21	4.35	4.46	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	200/1170	4.92	4.34	4.38	4.52	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	2	1	4	4	3.67	612/ 800	3.67	3.93	4.06	4.10	3.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 621 01  
 Title Methods Of Assessment  
 Instructor: O'Connor,David  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1253  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	169/1447	4.89	4.29	4.31	4.46	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	766/1447	4.33	4.13	4.27	4.30	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	541/1241	4.50	4.17	4.33	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	567/1402	4.44	4.10	4.24	4.29	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	529/1358	4.33	4.19	4.11	4.26	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	239/1316	4.67	4.03	4.14	4.34	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1201/1427	3.67	4.13	4.19	4.25	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	538/1447	4.89	4.70	4.69	4.74	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	309/1434	4.56	3.97	4.10	4.21	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	970/1387	4.33	4.37	4.46	4.51	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	607/1386	4.50	4.26	4.32	4.43	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	604/1380	4.56	4.23	4.32	4.38	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	455/1193	4.29	4.06	4.02	4.02	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	580/1172	4.25	4.02	4.15	4.32	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	470/1182	4.63	4.21	4.35	4.46	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	254/1170	4.88	4.34	4.38	4.52	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	547/ 800	3.83	3.93	4.06	4.10	3.83

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 622 01  
 Title Clinical Interventn I  
 Instructor: Diclemente, Carl  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1254  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.29	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	911/1447	4.20	4.13	4.27	4.30	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	380/1241	4.67	4.17	4.33	4.38	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	616/1402	4.40	4.10	4.24	4.29	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	452/1358	4.40	4.19	4.11	4.26	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	671/1316	4.20	4.03	4.14	4.34	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	842/1427	4.20	4.13	4.19	4.25	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	754/1447	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.74	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	634/1434	4.25	3.97	4.10	4.21	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	429/1387	4.75	4.37	4.46	4.51	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.26	4.32	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.23	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	131/1193	4.75	4.06	4.02	4.02	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	282/1172	4.67	4.02	4.15	4.32	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	430/1182	4.67	4.21	4.35	4.46	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	480/1170	4.67	4.34	4.38	4.52	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	3.93	4.06	4.10	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 2	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 3	Non-major 5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0				
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	0		
				? 0				

Course-Section: PSYC 665 1  
 Title Advsem:Drugs And Behav  
 Instructor: DeFulio,Anthony  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1255  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	1022/1447	4.08	4.29	4.31	4.46	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	7	2	0	2.77	1419/1447	2.77	4.13	4.27	4.30	2.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	6	4	2	1	2.85	1226/1241	2.85	4.17	4.33	4.38	2.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	976/1402	4.00	4.10	4.24	4.29	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	563/1358	4.31	4.19	4.11	4.26	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1316	****	4.03	4.14	4.34	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	1	0	8	3.92	1055/1427	3.92	4.13	4.19	4.25	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	6	5	1	3.46	1253/1434	3.46	3.97	4.10	4.21	3.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	839/1387	4.46	4.37	4.46	4.51	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	962/1386	4.15	4.26	4.32	4.43	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	2	6	4.00	1030/1380	4.00	4.23	4.32	4.38	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	4	5	3	3.69	879/1193	3.69	4.06	4.02	4.02	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	6	1	3.64	941/1172	3.64	4.02	4.15	4.32	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	2	5	2	1	3.00	1140/1182	3.00	4.21	4.35	4.46	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	616/1170	4.45	4.34	4.38	4.52	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	2	9	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 800	****	3.93	4.06	4.10	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	****	3.71	4.34	4.79	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.10	4.48	4.73	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 187	****	3.95	4.33	4.67	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.88	4.58	4.71	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.63	4.42	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	4.50	4.09	4.18	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 669 01  
 Title Organiz Beh Mgmt  
 Instructor: Rosen, Theodore  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1256  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	1022/1447	4.20	4.29	4.31	4.46	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	1123/1447	4.30	4.13	4.27	4.30	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	3	0	0	6	3	4.33	717/1241	4.33	4.17	4.33	4.38	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	6	3	3.79	1148/1402	4.29	4.10	4.24	4.29	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	5	4	3.93	893/1358	4.05	4.19	4.11	4.26	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	4	5	4.00	812/1316	4.33	4.03	4.14	4.34	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	882/1427	4.24	4.13	4.19	4.25	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	1139/1447	4.63	4.70	4.69	4.74	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	503/1434	4.43	3.97	4.10	4.21	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	5	1	8	4.21	1071/1387	4.44	4.37	4.46	4.51	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	919/1387	4.86	4.72	4.73	4.81	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	793/1386	4.51	4.26	4.32	4.43	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	3	5	3.86	1128/1380	3.93	4.23	4.32	4.38	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	288/1193	4.42	4.06	4.02	4.02	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	3	7	3.93	782/1172	3.96	4.02	4.15	4.32	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	320/1182	4.56	4.21	4.35	4.46	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	352/1170	4.81	4.34	4.38	4.52	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	335/ 800	4.63	3.93	4.06	4.10	4.25
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.88	4.58	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 62	****	4.63	4.56	4.69	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 669 02  
 Title Organiz Beh Mgmt  
 Instructor: Sigurdsson, Sigu  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1257  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	790/1447	4.20	4.29	4.31	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	352/1447	4.30	4.13	4.27	4.30	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	165/1402	4.29	4.10	4.24	4.29	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	690/1358	4.05	4.19	4.11	4.26	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	239/1316	4.33	4.03	4.14	4.34	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	680/1427	4.24	4.13	4.19	4.25	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	673/1447	4.63	4.70	4.69	4.74	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	341/1434	4.43	3.97	4.10	4.21	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	566/1387	4.44	4.37	4.46	4.51	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	4.86	4.72	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	431/1386	4.51	4.26	4.32	4.43	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1030/1380	3.93	4.23	4.32	4.38	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	420/1193	4.42	4.06	4.02	4.02	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	710/1172	3.96	4.02	4.15	4.32	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	691/1182	4.56	4.21	4.35	4.46	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	295/1170	4.81	4.34	4.38	4.52	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 800	4.63	3.93	4.06	4.10	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	3.10	4.34	4.82	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	3.71	4.34	4.79	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.10	4.48	4.73	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	3.95	4.33	4.67	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 168	****	4.17	4.20	4.55	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 686 01  
 Title Ethical & Pro Issues  
 Instructor: Simpson,Tara H  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1258  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	640/1447	4.46	4.29	4.31	4.46	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	315/1447	4.69	4.13	4.27	4.30	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	923/1241	4.00	4.17	4.33	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	715/1402	4.31	4.10	4.24	4.29	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	7	2	3.69	1063/1358	3.69	4.19	4.11	4.26	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	2	3	3	3.23	1228/1316	3.23	4.03	4.14	4.34	3.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	256/1427	4.69	4.13	4.19	4.25	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	4	7	2	3.85	1024/1434	3.85	3.97	4.10	4.21	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	891/1387	4.42	4.37	4.46	4.51	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	707/1387	4.83	4.72	4.73	4.81	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	663/1386	4.46	4.26	4.32	4.43	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	4	5	3.85	1133/1380	3.85	4.23	4.32	4.38	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	262/1193	4.55	4.06	4.02	4.02	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	261/1172	4.69	4.02	4.15	4.32	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	480/1182	4.62	4.21	4.35	4.46	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	559/1170	4.54	4.34	4.38	4.52	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	423/ 800	4.00	3.93	4.06	4.10	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 8	Major 0	
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 13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0				
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	0		
				? 0				



Course-Section: PSYC 710 01  
 Title Research Methods  
 Instructor: Murphy,Christop  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 1259  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	408/1447	4.67	4.29	4.31	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	938/1447	4.17	4.13	4.27	4.30	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	844/1241	4.17	4.17	4.33	4.38	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	143/1402	4.83	4.10	4.24	4.29	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1084/1358	3.67	4.19	4.11	4.26	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	112/1316	4.83	4.03	4.14	4.34	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	3	1	3.33	1312/1427	3.33	4.13	4.19	4.25	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	540/1434	4.33	3.97	4.10	4.21	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	307/1387	4.83	4.37	4.46	4.51	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1055/1387	4.60	4.72	4.73	4.81	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	607/1386	4.50	4.26	4.32	4.43	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	659/1380	4.50	4.23	4.32	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1050/1193	3.20	4.06	4.02	4.02	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	1067/1172	3.20	4.02	4.15	4.32	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	996/1182	3.80	4.21	4.35	4.46	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	976/1170	3.80	4.34	4.38	4.52	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	795/ 800	2.00	3.93	4.06	4.10	2.00

Frequency Distribution

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