IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT

Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT Instructor: BRYAN, KATHY (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 3

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 55 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	814/1639	4.36	4.41	4.27	4.08	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1090/1639	4.20	4.31	4.22	4.17	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	4.78	4.38	4.28	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	697/1583	4.35	4.47	4.19	4.01	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	236/1532	4.44	4.38	4.01	3.88	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	544/1504	4.38	4.41	4.05	3.78	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1044/1612	4.08	4.31	4.16	4.10	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.03	4.55	4.65	4.56	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	569/1579	4.19	4.40	4.08	3.95	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	602/1518	4.71	4.58	4.43	4.38	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	4.98	4.90	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	800/1517	4.49	4.49	4.27	4.20	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	457/1550	3.79	3.80	4.22	4.17	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	398/1295	4.49	4.30	3.94	3.84	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	770/1398	4.20	4.45	4.07	3.85	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	4.89	4.61	4.30	4.07	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	4.89	4.65	4.28	4.01	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	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	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				2	0						

Course-Section: AMST 100 0101 University of Maryland Page 56
Title IDEAS/IMAGES: AMER CULT Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2007

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	814/1639	4.36	4.41	4.27	4.08	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1090/1639	4.20	4.31	4.22	4.17	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	4.78	4.38	4.28	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	697/1583	4.35	4.47	4.19	4.01	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	236/1532	4.44	4.38	4.01	3.88	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	544/1504	4.38	4.41	4.05	3.78	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1044/1612	4.08	4.31	4.16	4.10	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.03	4.55	4.65	4.56	4.00
Lecture														
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1518/1550	3.79	3.80	4.22	4.17	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	770/1398	4.20	4.45	4.07	3.85	4.00
. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	4.89	4.61	4.30	4.07	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	4.89	4.65	4.28	4.01	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	3	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	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	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT

Instructor: BRYAN, KATHY

Enrollment: 35
Questionnaires: 24

Title

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 57 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	6	14	4.42	740/1639	4.36	4.41	4.27	4.08	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	17	4.61	415/1639	4.20	4.31	4.22	4.17	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	722/1397	4.78	4.38	4.28	4.18	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	625/1583	4.35	4.47	4.19	4.01	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	4	7	10	4.00	774/1532	4.44	4.38	4.01	3.88	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	9	13	4.46	429/1504	4.38	4.41	4.05	3.78	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	5	13	4.25	814/1612	4.08	4.31	4.16	4.10	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	20	3	4.08	1462/1635	4.03	4.55	4.65	4.56	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	2	10	6	4.05	859/1579	4.19	4.40	4.08	3.95	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	454/1518	4.71	4.58	4.43	4.38	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	273/1520	4.98	4.90	4.70	4.61	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	417/1517	4.49	4.49	4.27	4.20	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	414/1550	3.79	3.80	4.22	4.17	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	3	18	4.65	191/1295	4.49	4.30	3.94	3.84	4.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	369/1398	4.20	4.45	4.07	3.85	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	489/1391	4.89	4.61	4.30	4.07	4.67
Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	496/1388	4.89	4.65	4.28	4.01	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	1	4	2	1	3	3.09	834/ 958	3.09	4.14	3.93	3.71	3.09

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	24	Non-major	21
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title MULTICULTURAL AMERICA

Page 58 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: MOFFITT, KIMBER (Instr. A)
Enrollment: 38

Fall 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	-	Mean	Mean	Mean
_															
	General														
1	. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	4	16	4.59	518/1639	4.76	4.41	4.27	4.35	4.59
2	. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	425/1639	4.64	4.31	4.22	4.27	4.59
3	. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	661/1397	4.44	4.38	4.28	4.39	4.41
4	. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	476/1583	4.63	4.47	4.19	4.28	4.50
5	. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	4	13	4.43	419/1532	4.48	4.38	4.01	4.09	4.43
6	. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	404/1504	4.47	4.41	4.05	4.09	4.48
7	. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	376/1612	4.54	4.31	4.16	4.21	4.62
8	. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	12	7	4.30	1311/1635	4.65	4.55	4.65	4.63	4.30
9	. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	241/1579	4.55	4.40	4.08	4.14	4.67
	Lecture														
	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	561/1518	4.77	4.58	4.43	4.48	4.70
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	674/1520	4.93	4.90	4.70	4.78	4.85
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	371/1517	4.77	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.70
	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	2	17	4.75	351/1550	3.57	3.80	4.22	4.33	3.44
5	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	1	1	6	11	4.25	459/1295	4.38	4.30	3.94	4.07	4.25
	Discussion	_	_	_	_		_								
	. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	260/1398	4.72	4.45	4.07	4.14	4.75
	. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	525/1391	4.50	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.63
	. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	631/1388	4.65	4.65	4.28	4.37	4.53
4	. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	296/ 958	4.18	4.14	3.93	4.00	4.36
	Laboratory														
1	<u> -</u>	2.2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	1 22	****
	. Did the lab increase understanding of the material . Were you provided with adequate background information	22 22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	****	****	4.10	4.33 4.47	****
	. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
		22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 215	****	****	4.44	4.43	***
	. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.43	****
Э	. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	U	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	***/ 198		* * * *	4.18	4.08	
	Seminar														
1	. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.00	****
	. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	3.00	****
	. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	****	****
	. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	2.00	****
	. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	2.50	4.16	4.00	****
	5 5														
	Field Work														
1	. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2	. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	***
3	Was the instructor available for consultation		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****
4	. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****
	. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	***
	Self Paced														
1	. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	3.24	***

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	43	***	****	4.69	***	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	21	****	****	4.52	3.00	***

MULTICULTURAL AMERICA

Instructor: MOFFITT, KIMBER (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 38 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 58 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 23

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 2	А	 4	Required for Majors	 5	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sid	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_		_	
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title MULTICULTURAL AMERICA

(Instr. B)

Instructor:

Fall 2007

Page 59 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 23

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Fre	equer	ncie	3		Tnat	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.ava l	Sect
	Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	4	16	4.59	518/1639	4.76	4.41	4.27	4.35	4.59
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	425/1639	4.64	4.31	4.22	4.27	4.59
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	661/1397	4.44	4.38	4.28	4.39	4.41
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	476/1583	4.63	4.47	4.19	4.28	4.50
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	4	13	4.43	419/1532	4.48	4.38	4.01	4.09	4.43
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	404/1504	4.47	4.41	4.05	4.09	4.48
	Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	376/1612	4.54	4.31	4.16	4.21	4.62
	How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	12	7	4.30	1311/1635	4.65	4.55	4.65	4.63	
	•														
	Lecture														
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	1	1	6	0	1	0	2.13	1516/1550	3.57	3.80	4.22	4.33	3.44
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1295	4.38	4.30	3.94	4.07	4.25
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	260/1398	4.72	4.45	4.07	4.14	4.75
2.	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	525/1391	4.50	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.63
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	631/1388	4.65	4.65	4.28	4.37	4.53
4.	Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	296/ 958	4.18	4.14	3.93	4.00	4.36
	-														
	Laboratory														
1.	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	***	***	4.10	4.33	****
2.	Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	***	****	4.11	4.47	****
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	***	***	4.44	4.61	****
4.	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	***	***	4.35	4.43	****
	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	***	***	4.18	4.08	****
	Seminar														
1.	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	***	5.00	4.58	4.00	****
2.	Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	3.00	****
3.	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	****	****
4.	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	2.00	****
	Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	***	2.50	4.16	4.00	****
	Field Work														
1.	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	***	****	4.04	4.78	****
2.	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	***	****	4.05	4.28	****
3.	Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	***	****	4.75	****	****
4.	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	***	****	4.58	****	****
5.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	***	****	4.56	****	****
	Self Paced														
1.	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	***	****	4.45	3.24	****
2.	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****
3.	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****
4.	. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****
5.	Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****

MULTICULTURAL AMERICA

Instructor:

Title

(Instr. B)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 59 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 23

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	 А	4	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General		Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Title MULTICULTURAL AMERICA
Instructor: MOFFITT, KIMBER (Instr. A)

Page 60 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 13
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect		
	Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	137/1639	4.76	4.41	4.27	4.35	4.92
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	316/1639	4.64	4.31	4.22	4.27	4.69
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	574/1397	4.44	4.38	4.28	4.39	4.46
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	228/1583	4.63	4.47	4.19	4.28	4.77
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	317/1532		4.38	4.01	4.09	4.54
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	416/1504		4.41	4.05	4.09	4.46
	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	546/1612	4.54	4.31	4.16	4.21	4.46
	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	4.65	4.55	4.65	4.63	5.00
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	473/1579	4.55	4.40	4.08	4.14	4.43
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	301/1518	4.77	4.58	4.43	4.48	4.85
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1520	4.93	4.90	4.70	4.78	5.00
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	206/1517	4.77	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.85
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.92	139/1550	3.57	3.80	4.22	4.33	3.71
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	3	0		4.50	265/1295		4.30	3.94		4.50
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	309/1398	4.72	4.45	4.07	4.14	4.69
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	1	0	10	4.38	710/1391	4.50	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.38
3.	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	375/1388	4.65	4.65	4.28	4.37	4.77
4.	Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	456/ 958	4.18	4.14	3.93	4.00	4.00
	Laboratory														
1	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.33	****
	Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	****	****	4.10	4.33	****
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 219	****	***	4.44	4.47	****
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 215	***	***	4.35	4.43	***
	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****
٥.	were requirements for tab reports creatly specified	12	O	O	O	O	O	_	3.00	, 150			1.10	1.00	
	Seminar														
	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.00	****
2.	Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	3.00	****
3.	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	****	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	2.00	****
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	2.50	4.16	4.00	****
	Field Work														
1	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****
	Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****
	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32	****	****	4.56	***	****
	•														
	Self Paced														
1.	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	***	****	4.45	3.24	***

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	32	***	***	4.51	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	43	***	***	4.69	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****

MULTICULTURAL AMERICA

Instructor: MOFFITT, KIMBER (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 16 Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 60 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 13

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

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

University of Maryland MULTICULTURAL AMERICA Baltimore County

Title

Instructor:

(Instr. C) Fall 2007 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 61

Enrollment:	16
Ouestionnaires:	13

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
	General														
	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	137/1639		4.41		4.35	4.92
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	316/1639	4.64	4.31	4.22	4.27	4.69
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	574/1397	4.44	4.38	4.28	4.39	4.46
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	228/1583		4.47	4.19	4.28	4.77
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	317/1532	4.48	4.38	4.01	4.09	4.54
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	416/1504		4.41	4.05	4.09	4.46
	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	546/1612	4.54	4.31	4.16	4.21	4.46
8.	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	4.65	4.55	4.65	4.63	5.00
	Lecture														
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	4	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/1550	3.57	3.80	4.22	4.33	3.71
	•														
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	309/1398	4.72	4.45	4.07	4.14	4.69
2.	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	1	0	10	4.38	710/1391	4.50	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.38
3.	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	375/1388	4.65	4.65	4.28	4.37	4.77
4.	Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	456/ 958	4.18	4.14	3.93	4.00	4.00
-1	Laboratory	1.0	0	0	_	-	0	0	2 00	**** / 004		ale ale ale ale	4 10	4 22	
	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.33	****
	Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 215	***	****	4.35	4.43	****
5.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****
	Seminar														
1.	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.00	****
2.		12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	3.00	****
3.	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	****	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	2.00	***
	Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	2.50	4.16	4.00	****
	Field Work		_	_	_	_	_								
	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****
	Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****
5.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	***	****	4.56	****	****
	Self Paced														
1	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	3.24	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****
	Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****
٥.	one chough proceeds for all the beauties		0	3	5	5	3	_	2.00	, 21			1.52	5.00	

MULTICULTURAL AMERICA

Instructor:

Title

(Instr. C)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 61 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ear	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 6	Required for Majors	3	 Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	4	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

INTRO MEDIA STUDIES

(Instr. A) KING, PAULA

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 62 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 27

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
<b>~</b>														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	8	15	4.37	780/1639	4.41	4.41	4.27	4.35	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	7	14	4.26	859/1639	4.40	4.31	4.22	4.27	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	9	13	4.30	758/1397	4.22	4.38	4.28	4.39	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	17	4.48	500/1583	4.51	4.47	4.19	4.28	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	3	4	6	11	4.04	744/1532	4.26	4.38	4.01	4.09	4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	5	8	11	4.25	612/1504	4.38	4.41	4.05	4.09	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	2	5	15	4.38	669/1612	4.38	4.31	4.16	4.21	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	6	18	4.64	1023/1635	4.68	4.55	4.65	4.63	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	11	10	4.29	612/1579	4.47	4.40	4.08	4.14	4.29
Lecture	_	_	_	_	_	_								
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	877/1518	4.50	4.58	4.43	4.48	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	648/1520	4.88	4.90	4.70	4.78	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	547/1517	4.53	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	0	2	4	15	4.45	703/1550	4.04	3.80	4.22	4.33	3.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	3	3	5	10	3.91	731/1295	4.30	4.30	3.94	4.07	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	511/1398	4.56	1 1E	4.07	4.14	1 11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5 5	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.41	471/1396	4.65	$4.45 \\ 4.61$	4.30	4.14	4.41 4.68
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5 5	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	533/1388		4.65	4.28	4.35	4.66
	5 5	2	0	2	4	9	5	3.85	554/ 958		4.14	3.93		3.85
4. Were special techniques successful	5	۷	U	۷	4	9	5	3.05	554/ 956	4.01	4.14	3.93	4.00	3.03
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	***
or were requirements for two reports ofedrif specified		ŭ	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	, 133			1110	1.00	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	****	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	2.00	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	***	2.50	4.16	4.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	3.24	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	***	****	4.51	4.33	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	***	****	4.69	****	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26 26	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32	****	****	4.69	1.00	****
T. was the reeuback/tutoring by proctors herpful	∠0	U	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	/ 32			4.3/	1.00	•• ••

INTRO MEDIA STUDIES

Instructor: KING, PAULA (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 62 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 41
Questionnaires: 27

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned Cum. GP			Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	 А	13	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	С	4	General	4	Under-grad	27	Non-major	25
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

01 University of Maryland

INTRO MEDIA STUDIES Baltimore County

Instructor: (

(Instr. D)

Enrollment: 41
Ouestionnaires: 27

Title

#### Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

2007

Fall

Page

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

63

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Ouestions 1 2 3 4 5 Mean NR NA Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 15 4.37 780/1639 4.41 4.41 4.27 4.35 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 14 4.26 859/1639 4.40 4.31 4.22 4.27 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 13 4.30 758/1397 4.22 4.38 4.28 4.39 4.30 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals Ω 17 4.48 500/1583 4.51 4.47 4.19 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 0 11 4.04 744/1532 4.26 4.38 4.01 4.09 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 11 4.25 612/1504 4.38 4.41 4.05 4.09 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 15 4.38 669/1612 4.38 4.31 4.16 4.21 4.38 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 4.64 1023/1635 4.68 4.55 4.65 4.63 4.64 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 26 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/1579 4.47 4.40 4.08 4.14 4.29 Lecture 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/1520 4.88 4.90 4.70 4.78 4.86 26 0 0 1 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 26 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/1517 4.53 4.49 4.27 4.34 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2.0 4 Ω 2.33 \*\*\*\*/1550 4.04 3.80 4.22 4.33 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 26 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/1295 4.30 4.30 3.94 4.07 3.91 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 12 4.41 511/1398 4.56 4.45 4.07 4.14 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 4.68 471/1391 4.65 4.61 4.30 4.35 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 16 4.64 533/1388 4.70 4.65 4.28 4.37 4.64 4. Were special techniques successful 5 5 3.85 554/ 958 4.01 4.14 3.93 4.00 3.85 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 240 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 26 0 0 0 4.11 4.47 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 26 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 198 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.18 4.08 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 25 0 0 0 1 4.50 \*\*\*\*/ 85 5.00 4.58 4.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 2.5 0 82 4.50 4.50 \*\*\*\*/ 4.52 3.00 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 25 0 4.50 \*\*\*\*/ 78 5.00 4.47 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 25 0 4.50 \*\*\*\*/ 80 \*\*\*\* 4.00 2.00 4.47 82 \*\*\*\* 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 25 0 4.50 \*\*\*\*/ 2.50 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 26 0 0 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 4.04 4.78 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 0 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 53 4.05 \*\*\*\* 26 42 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 26 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 4.75 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 37 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 26 4.58 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 32 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 26 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 0 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 4.45 3.24 26 0 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 26 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 32 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 26 0 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 43 4.69 32 \*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 26 0 0 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 4.37 1.00 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 21 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

Course-Section: AMST 222 0101 Title

INTRO MEDIA STUDIES

(Instr. D) Instructor:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 63 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 27

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	4	Under-grad	27	Non-major	25
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	_			
				?	0						

INTRO MEDIA STUDIES

Title Instructor: KING, PAULA

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 32

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 64 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

bradent	COULSE	ii vai ua cii oii	Ouestionnaire

			Frequencies		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR NA		1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	11	16	4.34	806/1639	4.41	4.41	4.27	4.35	4.34
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	15	15	4.41	684/1639	4.40	4.31	4.22	4.27	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	6	12	12	4.13	916/1397	4.22	4.38	4.28	4.39	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	17	14	4.38	640/1583	4.51	4.47	4.19	4.28	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	7	20	4.44	409/1532	4.26	4.38	4.01	4.09	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	12	15	4.28	585/1504	4.38	4.41	4.05	4.09	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	11	16	4.28	779/1612	4.38	4.31	4.16	4.21	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	23	4.72	943/1635	4.68	4.55	4.65	4.63	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	13	16	4.55	332/1579	4.47	4.40	4.08	4.14	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	13	18	4.58	708/1518	4.50	4.58	4.43	4.48	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	382/1520	4.88	4.90	4.70	4.78	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	18	13	4.42	713/1517	4.53	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	24	4.66	468/1550	4.04	3.80	4.22	4.33	4.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	5	13	11	4.21	497/1295	4.30	4.30	3.94	4.07	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	12	19	4.56	391/1398	4.56	4.45	4.07	4.14	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	3	8	21	4.56	572/1391	4.65	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	5	27	4.84	286/1388	4.70	4.65	4.28	4.37	4.84
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	2	7	13	9	3.94	508/ 958	4.01	4.14	3.93	4.00	3.94
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.33	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	***	****	4.18	4.08	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	****	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	2.00	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 82	***	2.50	4.16	4.00	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	***	****	4.45	3.24	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/	43	****	****	4.69	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00 ****/	21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****

Title INTRO MEDIA STUDIES

Instructor: KING, PAULA

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 32

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 64 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	7	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	3	A :	 10	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	5	Under-grad	32	Non-major	25
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 222 0301 Title

INTRO MEDIA STUDIES

SNYDER, DONALD Instructor:

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 13

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 65 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	^	0	1	4	0	4 54	F00/1630	4 41	4 41	4 07	4 25	4 54
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	Ţ	4	8	4.54	582/1639	4.41	4.41	4.27	4.35	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	316/1639	4.40	4.31	4.22	4.27	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	8	4	4.15	888/1397	4.22	4.38	4.28	4.39	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	299/1583	4.51	4.47	4.19	4.28	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	335/1532	4.26	4.38	4.01	4.09	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	202/1504	4.38	4.41	4.05	4.09	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	490/1612	4.38	4.31	4.16	4.21	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	928/1635	4.68	4.55	4.65	4.63	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	332/1579	4.47	4.40	4.08	4.14	4.56
Lecture	_	_	_		_	_	_							
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	863/1518	4.50	4.58	4.43	4.48	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	699/1520	4.88	4.90	4.70	4.78	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	462/1517	4.53	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	424/1550	4.04	3.80	4.22	4.33	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	129/1295	4.30	4.30	3.94	4.07	4.77
Discussion														
	0	0	^	0	0	_	11	4 05	104/1200	4 50	4 4 5	4 07	1 1 1	4 05
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	194/1398	4.56	4.45	4.07	4.14	4.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	Ţ	2	10	4.69	462/1391	4.65	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	459/1388	4.70	4.65	4.28	4.37	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful		1	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	260/ 958	4.01	4.14	3.93	4.00	4.42
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	2.00	****
		-	-	-	_	-	-		, 00					

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	_			
				?	0						

APPROACH IN AMER STUDI Baltimo

Instructor: BRYAN, KATHY

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 14

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 66 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1				ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	1 12	726/1639	4.43	4.41	4.27	4.35	4.43
	Ū	Ū	0	Τ	Τ	2	9	4.43						
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0		3 1	∠ 1	/		1090/1639	4.00	4.31	4.22	4.27	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	•	Ţ	_	Τ	5	4.25	795/1397	4.25	4.38	4.28	4.39	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	Τ	Τ	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.47	4.19	4.28	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	Τ	1	6	6	4.21	616/1532	4.21	4.38	4.01	4.09	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	Τ	3	10	4.64	260/1504	4.64	4.41	4.05	4.09	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	837/1612	4.23	4.31	4.16	4.21	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	./		1114/1635		4.55	4.65	4.63	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	725/1579	4.20	4.40	4.08	4.14	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	0	1	7	4.30	1053/1518	4.30	4.58	4.43	4.48	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	546/1520	4.90	4.90	4.70	4.78	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	1	0	8	4.27	882/1550	4.27	3.80	4.22	4.33	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	313/1295		4.30	3.94	4.07	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	369/1398		4.45	4.07	4.14	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	227/1391	4.90	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	423/1388	4.73	4.65	4.28	4.37	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful		0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	179/ 958	4.60	4.14	3.93	4.00	4.60
Laboratowy														
Laboratory  Nere recessive materials available for lab activities		0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 219	****	****	1 11	1 61	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	/ 219			4.44	4.61	

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

ETHNOGRAPHY IN AMERICA

Title Instructor:

HUMMEL, MICHAEL (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 31 Questionnaires: 21

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 67 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnarie

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	6	6	7	3.76	1352/1639	3.76	4.41	4.27	4.28	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	11	4		1410/1639	3.67	4.31	4.22	4.20	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	973/1397		4.38	4.28	4.26	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	9	8	4.10	939/1583	4.10	4.47	4.19	4.24	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	0	5		3.90	911/1532	3.90	4.38	4.01	4.05	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	1	5		3.95	884/1504		4.41	4.05	4.12	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	7	7		1273/1612		4.31	4.16	4.12	3.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11			1195/1635	4.45	4.55	4.65	4.66	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	0	4	9	2	3.53	1308/1579	3.53	4.40	4.08	4.07	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	0	5	5	7	3 79	1357/1518	3.79	4.58	4.43	4.39	3.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	571/1520	4.89	4.90	4.70	4.68	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	1	4	9	3		1339/1517	3.53	4.49	4.27	4.23	3.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	0	6	5	5		1380/1550	2.39	3.80	4.22	4.20	2.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	6	2	4	0			1272/1295		4.30	3.94		2.08
J. Did dddiovibadi ccomiqueb cimanec jour anderstanding	-	Ü	Ü	_	-	Ü	-	2.00	12,2,12,5	2.00	1.50	3.71	3.73	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	0	4	2	7	3.63	1059/1398	3.63	4.45	4.07	4.13	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	5	1	8	3.94	1040/1391	3.94	4.61	4.30	4.35	3.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	828/1388	4.26	4.65	4.28	4.34	4.26
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	1	0	4	3	5	3.85	558/ 958	3.85	4.14	3.93	3.97	3.85
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 82	****	2.50	4.16	4.08	****
									, -					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities		1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful		1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18 18	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****
3 chere chough proceeds for all the beautiful	_0	_	J	3	5	5	2	5.00	, 21			1.52	5.00	

ETHNOGRAPHY IN AMERICA

HUMMEL, MICHAEL (Instr. A)

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 31 Questionnaires: 21 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 67 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	arned Cum. GPA			Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	21	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				?	0						

Title

Instructor:

03 0101 University of Maryland

ETHNOGRAPHY IN AMERICA Baltimore County

/ Tratra

(Instr. C)

Fall 2007

Page 68 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	31					
Questionnaires:	21		Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
a 1														
General  1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	6	6	7	3 76	1352/1639	3.76	4.41	4.27	4.28	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	11	4		1410/1639		4.31	4.22	4.20	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	973/1397		4.38	4.28	4.26	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	9	8	4.10	939/1583		4.47	4.19	4.24	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	0	5	10	3.90	911/1532		4.38	4.01	4.05	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	1	5	10	3.95	884/1504		4.41	4.05	4.12	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	7	7		1273/1612		4.31	4.16	4.12	3.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	9		1195/1635			4.65	4.66	4.45
Lecture														
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	8	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1550	2.39	3.80	4.22	4.20	2.39
•														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	0	4	2	7		1059/1398		4.45	4.07	4.13	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	5	1	8		1040/1391	3.94	4.61	4.30	4.35	3.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	828/1388			4.28	4.34	4.26
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	1	0	4	3	5	3.85	558/ 958	3.85	4.14	3.93	3.97	3.85
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	4.59	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	2.50	4.16	4.08	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 37	***	****	4.58	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal		0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful		0	0	0	0	0	4		****/ 43		****	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17 18	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	0	0	2	0.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	***
	-	_	-	-	-	-	_		,					

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	21	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

ETHNOGRAPHY IN AMERICA Balt

Title ETHNOGRAPHY IN AMERICA Instructor: (Instructor)

(Instr. D)

Page 69 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2007

			Frequencies						tructor	Course	Dont	TIMDC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2 2	3	s 4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	6	6	7		1352/1639	3.76	4.41	4.27	4.28	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	11	4		1410/1639	3.67	4.31	4.22	4.20	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	973/1397		4.38	4.28	4.26	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	9	8	4.10	939/1583	4.10	4.47	4.19	4.24	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	0	5	10	3.90	911/1532	3.90	4.38	4.01	4.05	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	1	5	10		884/1504	3.95	4.41	4.05	4.12	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3 0	3	7	/		1273/1612		4.31	4.16	4.12	3.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	U	0	11	9	4.45	1195/1635	4.45	4.55	4.65	4.66	4.45
Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1520	4.89	4.90	4.70	4.68	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	4	0	6	0	0	0	2.00	1518/1550	2.39	3.80	4.22	4.20	2.39
Discussion	_	0	2	0	4	0	-	2 (2	1050/1200	2 (2	4 4 5	4 07	4 12	2 (2
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3 0	0 2	4 5	1	/		1059/1398	3.63	4.45	4.07 4.30	4.13	3.63
<ol> <li>Were all students actively encouraged to participate</li> <li>Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion</li> </ol>	5	0	0	1	2	7	0	4.26	1040/1391 828/1388	3.94 4.26	4.61 4.65	4.28	4.35 4.34	3.94 4.26
4. Were special techniques successful	2 5	3	1	0	4	3	5	3.85	558/ 958	3.85	4.14		3.97	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	1	U	4	3	5	3.05	556/ 956	3.05	4.14	3.93	3.97	3.05
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****
Combras														
Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 82	****	4.50	4.50	4.50	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 82		2.50	4.16	4.08	****
J. Here driveria for grading made drear		Ü	Ü	Ū	-	Ü	_	1.00	, 02		2.30	1.10	1.00	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	1	0	0	2	1.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 32	***	****	4.56	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	21	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enougi	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Title

GENDER AND INEQUALITY

TAYLOR, DABRINA (Instr. A)

Instructor: Enrollment:

Baltimore County Fall 2007

University of Maryland

Page 70 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 27 Student Course Eva	.luation Qu	uestionnaire
---------------------------------------	-------------	--------------

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	Ο	Ο	3	4	18	4.60	508/1639	4.54	4.41	4.27	4.28	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	6	17	4.50	517/1639	4.45	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	17	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	517/1397	4.52	4.38	4.28	4.26	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	5	18	4.60	371/1583	4.57	4.47	4.19	4.24	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	178/1532		4.38	4.01	4.05	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	291/1504	4.52	4.41	4.05	4.12	4.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	6	5	15	4.35	706/1612	4.39	4.31	4.16	4.12	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	5	20	4.69	968/1635	4.40	4.55	4.65	4.66	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	8	11	4.36	538/1579	4.38	4.40	4.08	4.07	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	3	18	4.65	616/1518		4.58	4.43	4.39	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1520	4.91	4.90	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	3	17	4.57	523/1517	4.35	4.49	4.27	4.23	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	1	2	18	4.23	912/1550	3.38	3.80	4.22	4.20	3.12
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	1	7	14	4.48	289/1295	4.18	4.30	3.94	3.95	4.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	349/1398	4.71	4.45	4.07	4.13	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	356/1391	4.84	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	4	16	4.67	496/1388	4.74	4.65	4.28	4.34	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	8	13	2	0	0	2	2		****/ 958	****	4.14	3.93	3.97	****
•														
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	9	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	С	1	General	7	Under-grad	27	Non-major	22
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: AMST 310 0101 University of Maryland Title GENDER AND INEQUALITY

Baltimore County Fall 2007

(Instr. C) Instructor:

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 27

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 71

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean		Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from t	this course	2	0	0	0	3	4	18	4.60	508/1639	4.54	4.41	4.27	4.28	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expec		1	0	0	1	2	6	17	4.50	517/1639	4.45	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expe	ected goals	2	17	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	517/1397	4.52	4.38	4.28	4.26	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the exped	cted goals	2	0	0	1	1	5	18	4.60	371/1583	4.57	4.47	4.19	4.24	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what	at you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	178/1532	4.67	4.38	4.01	4.05	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to v	what you learned	3	1	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	291/1504	4.52	4.41	4.05	4.12	4.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explaine	ed	1	0	0	0	6	5	15	4.35	706/1612	4.39	4.31	4.16	4.12	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled		1	0	0	1	0	5	20	4.69	968/1635	4.40	4.55	4.65	4.66	4.69
Lecture															
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you	ı learned	16	6	1	2	0	2	0	2.60	****/1550	3.38	3.80	4.22	4.20	3.12
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what	at you learned	8	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	349/1398	4.71	4.45	4.07	4.13	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged t	to participate	8	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	356/1391	4.84	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and o	open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	4	16	4.67	496/1388	4.74	4.65	4.28	4.34	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful		8	13	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	****/ 958	****	4.14	3.93	3.97	****
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background	ound information	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	***	****	4.11	4.08	****
	ıency	Dis	tribu	utior	1										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA		Reasons						Туре					Majors	3	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	9	Required for Majors	 5	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	С	1	General	7	Under-grad	27	Non-major	22
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				2	0						

Title GENDER AND INEQUALITY

Instructor: SABIO, INGRID

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 23

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 72 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Out and down	MD	277		equer			-		ructor	Course	-		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	14	4.43	712/1639	4.54	4.41	4.27	4.28	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	14	4.35	761/1639	4.45	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	467/1397	4.52	4.38	4.28	4.26	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	15	4.52	455/1583	4.57	4.47	4.19	4.24	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	17	4.52	323/1532	4.67	4.38	4.01	4.05	4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	5	14	4.35	537/1504	4.52	4.41	4.05	4.12	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	6	15	4.48	532/1612	4.39	4.31	4.16	4.12	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	7	13	3	3.83	1581/1635	4.40	4.55	4.65	4.66	3.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	517/1579	4.38	4.40	4.08	4.07	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	0	3	2	14	4 24	1110/1518	4.45	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	776/1520	4.91	4.90	4.70	4.68	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	0	5		4.14	-,	4.35	4.49	4.27	4.23	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	2	5	11		1161/1550		3.80	4.22	4.20	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	1	4	3	7		753/1295		4.30	3.94		3.88
o. Dia addiovidual occiminates cimanos your anacidodiding	_	J	_	_	-	J	•	3.00	.00,1200		1.50	3.71	3.75	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	183/1398	4.71	4.45	4.07	4.13	4.87
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	159/1391	4.84	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	255/1388	4.74	4.65	4.28	4.34	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	8	10	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 958	****	4.14	3.93	3.97	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.04	****
Seminar	0.0		_	-		•	•	0 00		4.4.4.4	0 50	4 3 6	4 00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	U	0	Τ	0	0	U	2.00	****/ 82	****	2.50	4.16	4.08	***
From	onar	Diat	- wib	u+i or	_									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	10	 Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	9	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	-			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 73

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Title TV IN AMERICAN CULTURE

HUMMEL, MICHAEL

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 34

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions				Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain mex insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 8. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1. Did you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7. Did 0. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Ecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Did you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Did written assignments of the material 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Were not provided with adequate background information 9. Were necessary materials available for individual attention 9. Were necessary materials available for individual attention 9. Were necessary materials available for individual attention 9. Did prosentations contribute to what you learned 9. Did prosentations contribute to what you learned 9. Did prosentati	Questions	NR	NA		_			5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain mew insights, skills from this course   0   0   0   0   5   14   15   4.29   850/1639   4.29   4.41   4.27   4.28   4.29   2.01   4.12   17.42   7.87															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the samm questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7. Was the instructor's learned 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. Were the instructor's learned end of the subject 1. Were the instructor's learned end explained clearly 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4. Did the learned end explained clearly 3. Was learned end explained clearly 4. Did the learned end explained clearly 5. Did audiovious techniques enhance your understanding 9. Loud and explained clearly 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were apil atudents actively encouraged to participate in 30 to 1 to 2 to 3 to 4.05 yellow 1. August 1. A			_		_	_									
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 2 2 6 24 6.53 497/1397 4.53 4.78 4.72 4.26 4.55 4. Did not be evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 2 10 4.89 407/1583 4.59 4.47 4.19 4.24 4.55 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 5 5 7 1 6 4.03 751/1582 4.03 4.79 4.01 4.05 4.03 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 5 5 7 1 6 4.03 751/1582 4.03 4.79 4.10 4.05 4.03 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 2 2 9 0 1 1 15 5 4.52 372/1579 4.52 4.00 4.03 4.12 4.42 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 1 15 1 15 4.52 372/1579 4.52 4.00 4.08 4.07 4.52 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 0 1 10 1 5 4.52 372/1579 4.52 4.40 4.08 4.07 4.52 1.00 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1			•	-	•	-									
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1 0 0 0 2 10 21 0.55 7 4.03 402/1583 4.05 4.47 4.19 4.24 4.58 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   1 0 0 0 2 2 9 20 4.42 466/1504 4.2 4.41 4.05 4.12 4.30 8. How many times was class cancelled   1 0 0 0 2 2 9 10 4.42 466/1504 4.2 4.41 4.05 4.12 4.30 8. How many times was class cancelled   1 0 0 0 2 1 9 10 4.13 10 16 1.2 4.07 4.13 4.16 4.12 4.30 8. How many times was class cancelled   1 0 0 0 1 15 17 4.48 1155/1635 4.48 4.55 4.66 4.48 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness   7 0 0 0 1 15 17 4.48 1155/1635 4.48 4.55 4.66 4.68 4.48 9. How would you grade the overall reaching effectiveness   7 0 0 0 1 10 10 15 4.52 372/1579 4.52 4.00 4.00 4.07 4.52 1.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00			-			_				- ,					
5. bid assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 5 5 7 7 16 4.03 751/1512 4.03 4.38 4.01 4.05 4.03 4.07 4.74 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 2 2 9 9 18 4.30 756/1612 4.30 4.31 4.16 4.12 4.30 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 1 15 7 4.48 1155/1635 4.48 4.55 4.65 4.68 4.89 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 0 1 11 15 4.52 372/1579 4.52 4.40 4.08 4.07 4.52 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.0						_									
6. Did writen assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 2 4 9 18 4.30 765/1612 4.30 4.31 4.10 4.12 4.42 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 1 15 17 4.48 1155/1635 4.48 4.55 4.65 4.66 4.48 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 1 11 15 5 4.52 372/1579 4.52 4.40 4.08 4.07 4.52  **Lecture**  Lecture**  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 1 0 6 22 4.69 575/1518 4.69 4.58 4.43 4.39 4.69 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 1 10 6 6 22 4.69 575/1518 4.69 4.58 4.43 4.39 4.69 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 1 0 1 2 11 7 4.42 755/1550 4.42 3.80 4.22 4.20 4.42 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 2 7 20 4.53 251/1295 4.53 4.30 3.94 3.95 4.53  **Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 2 9 9 9 4.24 831/1391 4.24 4.61 4.30 4.25 4.24 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 0 0 2 8 9 9 4.24 831/1391 4.24 4.61 4.30 4.55 4.24 4. Were special techniques successful 13 0 0 0 1 2 9 9 9 4.24 831/1391 4.24 4.61 4.30 4.95 4.24 4. Were recessary materials available for lab activities 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/240 **** 4.11 4.06 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/240 **** 4.11 4.08 ****  3. Were recessary materials available for lab activities 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/240 **** 4.54 4.54 4.54 4.54 4.54 4.54 4.54				-	-										
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 0 1 11 15 4.52 372/1579 4.52 4.40 4.08 4.07 4.52  Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 5 0 0 1 0 6 22 4.69 575/1518 4.69 4.58 4.43 4.39 4.69 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 1 1 9 20 4.63 1074/1520 4.63 4.90 4.70 4.68 4.63 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 1 1 9 20 4.63 1074/1520 4.63 4.90 4.70 4.68 4.63 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 1 1 0 7 4.77 6.84/1517 4.47 4.99 4.71 4.99 4.72 4.23 4.47 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 1 0 1 2 11 17 4.42 755/1550 4.42 3.80 4.22 4.20 4.42 5. Did audiovisual techniques enlance your understanding 4 0 0 1 2 7 20 4.53 251/1295 4.53 4.30 3.94 3.95 4.53  Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did the instructor encouraged to participate 13 0 0 1 2 9 9 4.24 831/1391 4.24 4.61 4.30 4.35 4.24 4. Were special techniques successful 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did the instructor encouraged to participate 13 0 0 1 2 9 8 12 4.45 693/188 4.45 4.65 4.84 4.45 4. Were special techniques successful 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 33 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 **** 85 *** 5.00 4.84 8.44 4. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 224 *** 4.51 4.65 4.65  Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor provide assistance 3. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3. Did the instructor available for lab activities 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were createrial available for lab activities 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5. Were subject to what you	-					-	,					4.38	4.01	4.05	4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 1 1 15 17 4.48 1155/1635 4.48 4.55 4.65 4.66 4.48 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 1 1 16 15 4.52 372/1579 4.52 4.04 0.08 4.07 4.52  **Lecture**  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 6 22 4.69 575/1518 4.69 4.58 4.43 4.39 4.69 2. Did the instructor seem interested and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 0 1 1 9 20 4.63 1074/1520 4.63 4.09 4.70 4.68 4.63 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 0 3 10 17 4.47 648/1517 4.47 4.49 4.27 4.23 4.47 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 1 0 1 2 11 17 4.42 755/1550 4.42 3.00 4.22 4.20 4.42 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0 0 1 2 2 7 20 4.53 251/1295 4.53 4.30 3.94 3.95 4.53  **Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 1 6 5 9 4.05 756/1398 4.05 4.45 4.07 4.13 4.05 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 1 1 2 9 9 4.24 831/1391 4.24 4.61 4.30 4.35 4.24 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 0 0 2 8 12 4.46 593/1388 4.45 4.65 4.28 4.34 4.45 4. Were special techniques successful 13 1 0 2 6 6 5 7 3.85 554/ 958 3.85 4.14 3.93 3.97 3.85  **Laboratory** 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/224 **** 4.11 4.08 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/224 **** 4.44 4.44 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/215 **** 4.35 4.21 **** 4. Did the lab instructor wailable for individual attention 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ***/8 5 **** 5.00 4.58 4.50 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 29 0 0 0 2 2 1 4.33 ***/8 5 **** 5.00 4.58 4.50 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 29 0 0 0 2 2 1 4.33 ***/8 5 **** 5.00 4.58 4.50 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/9 5 *	6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		0				9	20	4.42	466/1504	4.42	4.41	4.05	4.12	4.42
2. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness   7	7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0		2	4	9	18	4.30	756/1612	4.30	4.31	4.16	4.12	4.30
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4. O 0 0 1 9 20 4.63 1074/1520 4.63 4.90 4.70 4.68 4.63 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4. O 0 1 1 2 7 20 4.53 251/1295 4.23 3.80 4.22 4.20 4.42 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4. O 0 1 2 7 20 4.53 251/1295 4.23 4.30 3.94 3.95 4.53  Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 6 5 9 4.05 756/1398 4.05 4.45 4.07 4.13 4.05 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 1 2 9 9 4.24 831/1391 4.24 4.61 4.30 4.35 4.24 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 1 0 2 6 5 7 3.85 554/958 3.85 4.14 3.93 3.97 3.85  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/224 **** 4.10 4.06 ****  Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ***/85 *** 5.00 4.58 4.51  ***Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/198 **** 4.18 4.04 ****  Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ***/85 *** 5.00 4.58 4.50 ****  Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 31 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ***/85 **** 5.00 4.58 4.50 ****  Did field experience contribute to what you learned 32 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/198 **** 4.18 4.04 ****  Did field experience contribute to what you learned 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/198 **** 4.18 4.04 ****  Did field experience contribute to what you learned 33 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/198 **** 4.18 4.04 ****  Did field experience contribute to what you learned		1	0	0	0	1	15	17	4.48	1155/1635	4.48	4.55	4.65	4.66	4.48
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material prepared 3. Was lecture material prepared 4. 0 0 0 0 3 10 17 4.47 648/1517 4.47 4.98 4.97 4.23 4.47 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were special techniques successful 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 3. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 3. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 4. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5. Were requirements for grading made clear 5. Did draw the instructor available for individual attention 5. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 7. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7. Di	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	11	15	4.52	372/1579	4.52	4.40	4.08	4.07	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 0 1 1 9 20 4.63 1074/1520 4.63 4.90 4.70 4.68 4.63 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 1 2 1 1 17 4.47 648/1517 4.47 4.9 4.27 4.23 4.47 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 0 0 1 2 7 20 4.53 251/1295 4.53 4.30 3.94 3.95 4.53  Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 2 1 0 1 1 2 7 20 4.53 251/1295 4.53 4.30 3.94 3.95 4.53  Did the instructor encouraged to participate 9 1 2 0 0 0 1 2 8 12 4.56 95/1398 4.05 4.45 4.07 4.13 4.05  Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 1 2 9 9 4.24 831/1391 4.24 4.61 4.30 4.35 4.24  Were special techniques successful 13 1 0 2 6 5 7 3.85 554/958 3.85 4.14 3.93 3.97 3.85  Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9 2 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/224 **** 4.10 4.06 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/224 **** 4.11 4.08 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/224 **** 4.11 4.08 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/240 **** 4.18 4.04 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/240 **** 4.18 4.04 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/240 **** 4.50 4.52 4.59 **** 4. Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/240 **** 4.50 4.52 4.59 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/25 **** 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/25 **** 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/25 **** 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/35 **** 4. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3 0 0 0	Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. 0 0 0 0 1 1 9 20 4.63 1074/1520 4.63 4.90 4.70 4.68 4.63 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. 0 0 0 1 2 1 11 17 4.47 648/1517 4.47 4.94 4.27 4.23 4.47 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4. 0 0 1 2 1 1 17 4.42 755/1550 4.42 3.80 4.22 4.20 4.42 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4. 0 0 1 2 7 20 4.53 251/1295 4.53 4.30 3.94 3.95 4.53  Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Mere all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful 4. Were special techniques successful 5. Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7. Were you provided with adequate background information 7. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8. Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 8. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 9. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 9. Did gou clearly understand your evaluation criteria 9. Were criteria for grading made clear 9. Did gou clearly understand your evaluations 9. Were descended to the specified and the specified a	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	0	6	22	4.69	575/1518	4.69	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 0 3 10 17 4.47 648/1517 4.47 4.49 4.27 4.23 4.47 4. 10 4.40 1.20 1.20 1.10 1.20 1.10 1.20 1.10 1.40 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.2		4	0	0	0	1	9	20	4.63			4.90	4.70	4.68	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0 0 1 2 11 17 4.42 755/1550 4.42 3.80 4.22 4.20 4.42 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 0 0 1 2 7 20 4.53 251/1295 4.53 4.30 3.94 3.95 4.53    Discussion    1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 2 9 9 4.05 756/1398 4.05 4.45 4.07 4.13 4.05    2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 1 2 9 9 4.24 831/1391 4.24 4.61 4.30 4.35 4.24    3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 0 0 1 2 9 9 4.24 831/1391 4.24 4.61 4.30 4.35 4.24    4. Were special techniques successful 13 1 0 2 6 5 7 3.85 554/958 3.85 4.14 3.93 3.97 3.85    Laboratory   1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 244 **** **** 4.10 4.06 ****    2. Were you provided with adequate background information 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 240 **** **** 4.11 4.08 ****    3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 240 **** **** 4.14 4.04 ****    5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.18 4.04 ****    Seminar   1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.58 4.50 ****    2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 82 **** 4.50 4.52 4.59 ****    3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 82 **** 5.00 4.47 4.60 ****    5. Were criteria for grading made clear    31 Did field experience contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.04 4.78 ****    5. Did gou clearly understand your evaluation criteria 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.04 4.78 ****    5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	<u> </u>				0		10								
Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  Did conferences help you carry out field activities  Did conferences help you carry out field activ															
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 0 1 2 9 9 4.24 831/1391 4.24 4.61 4.30 4.35 4.24 4. Were special techniques successful 13 1 0 2 6 5 7 3.85 554/958 3.85 4.14 3.93 3.97 3.85  Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 224 **** 4.10 4.06 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 224 **** 4.11 4.08 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 215 **** 4.44 4.44 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 215 **** 4.44 4.44 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.18 4.04 ****  5. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.58 4.50 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.57 4.65 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 88 **** 4.00 4.47 4.65 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 82 **** 4.50 4.52 4.59 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** *** 4.04 4.78 **** 5. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** *** 4.04 4.78 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.56 4.30 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.56 4.30 *****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 34 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.56 4.30 ****  5. Did conference															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 6 5 9 4.05 756/1398 4.05 4.45 4.07 4.13 4.05 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 1 2 9 9 4.24 831/1391 4.24 4.61 4.30 4.35 4.24 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 0 0 2 8 12 4.45 693/1388 4.45 4.65 4.28 4.34 4.45 4. Were special techniques successful 13 1 0 2 6 6 5 7 3.85 554/958 3.85 4.14 3.93 3.97 3.85    Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 224 **** **** 4.10 4.06 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 240 **** **** 4.11 4.08 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 219 **** **** 4.44 4.44 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.18 4.04 **** 5. Were reguirements for lab reports clearly specified 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.18 4.04 ****    Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.58 4.50 ****    2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.57 4.59 ****    3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 80 **** 4.05 4.51 4.59 ****    4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 82 **** 4.50 4.57 4.50 ****    5. Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 22 **** 4.04 4.77 4.65 ****    5. Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.05 4.17 4.66 ****    5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.05 4.31 ****    5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.05 4.31 ****    5. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.05 4.31 ****    5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 0 0	5. Fix dudiovibual coomiques cimanee four understanding	•	J	Ü	-	_	,	20	1.33	231,12,3	1.33	1.30	3.71	3.73	1.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 1 2 9 9 4 .24 831/1391 4.24 4.61 4.30 4.35 4.24 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 0 0 0 2 8 12 4.45 693/1388 4.45 4.65 4.28 4.34 4.45 4.45 4.45 4.45 4.45 4.45 4.45															
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 0 0 2 8 12 4.45 693/1388 4.45 4.65 4.28 4.34 4.45 4.66 4.28 4.34 4.45 4.66 4.28 4.34 4.45 4.66 4.28 4.34 4.45 4.66 4.28 4.34 4.45 4.66 4.28 4.34 4.45 4.66 4.28 4.34 4.45 4.66 4.28 4.34 4.45 4.66 4.28 4.34 4.45 4.66 4.28 4.34 4.45 4.66 4.28 4.34 4.45 4.66 4.28 4.34 4.45 4.66 4.28 4.34 4.45 4.66 4.28 4.34 4.45 4.66 4.28 4.34 4.45 4.66 4.28 4.34 4.45 4.66 4.28 4.34 4.45 4.66 4.28 4.36 4.36 4.36 4.36 4.36 4.36 4.36 4.36	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1		5	9	4.05	756/1398	4.05	4.45	4.07	4.13	4.05
Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 224 **** **** 4.10 4.06 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 224 **** **** 4.11 4.08 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 219 **** **** 4.14 4.44 ****  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 215 **** **** 4.18 4.04 ****  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.18 4.04 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2 1 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.58 4.50 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 82 **** 4.50 4.52 4.59 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 82 **** 4.50 4.52 4.59 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 82 **** 4.50 4.74 4.66 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 82 **** 4.50 4.74 4.65 ****  5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 82 **** 4.50 4.74 4.65 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 82 **** 4.50 4.75 4.65 ****  6. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 82 **** 4.00 4.77 4.65 ****  7. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 82 **** 4.00 4.78 ****  8. Did green the field work 4.00 4.00 ****/ 82 **** 4.50 4.52 ****  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 82 **** 4.50 4.53 ****  5. Did gou clearly understand your evaluation criteria 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.56 4.30 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.56 4.30 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.56 4.30 *****	2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	2	9	9	4.24	831/1391	4.24	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.24
Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  2. Were you provided with adequate background information  33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 224 **** **** 4.10 4.06 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information  33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 240 **** **** 4.11 4.08 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 219 **** **** 4.44 4.44 ****  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance  33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 219 **** **** 4.44 4.44 ****  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.18 4.04 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  31 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.18 4.04 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  31 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ***/ 85 **** 5.00 4.58 4.50 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned  31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 78 **** 5.00 4.54 4.59 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned  31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 78 **** 5.00 4.47 4.60 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear  31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 78 **** 5.00 4.47 4.65 ****  5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.00 4.47 4.65 ****  4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.04 4.78 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.04 4.78 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluations  33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.05 4.31 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.56 4.30 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  34 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.56 4.30 ****  5. Elf Paced	3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	693/1388	4.45	4.65	4.28	4.34	4.45
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 224 **** **** 4.10 4.06 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 240 **** **** 4.11 4.08 **** 4.12 4.04 **** 4.11 4.08 **** 4.13 4.04 **** 4.14 4.04 **** 4.15 4.01 4.01 4.00 ****/ 219 **** **** 4.14 4.04 **** 4.16 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.00 ****/ 215 **** **** 4.17 4.07 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01	4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	2	6	5	7	3.85	554/ 958	3.85	4.14	3.93	3.97	3.85
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 224 **** **** 4.10 4.06 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 240 **** **** 4.11 4.08 **** 4.12 4.04 **** 4.11 4.08 **** 4.13 4.04 **** 4.14 4.04 **** 4.14 4.04 **** 4.15 4.01 4.01 4.00 ****/ 215 **** **** 4.14 4.04 **** 4.16 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.00 ****/ 215 **** **** 4.18 4.04 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.18 4.04 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.18 4.04 **** 5. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.58 4.50 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 82 **** 4.50 4.52 4.59 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 88 **** 4.50 4.47 4.66 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 82 **** 2.50 4.16 4.08 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 82 **** 4.00 4.47 4.65 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.04 4.78 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.56 4.30 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.56 4.30 ****	Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 240 **** **** 4.11 4.08 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 219 **** **** 4.44 4.44 **** 4.10 4.00 ****/ 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.18 4.04 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.18 4.04 ****    Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.58 4.50 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 82 **** 4.50 4.52 4.59 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 82 **** 5.00 4.47 4.60 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 29 0 0 0 2 2 1 3.80 ****/ 80 **** 4.00 4.47 4.65 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 82 **** 2.50 4.16 4.08 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.04 4.78 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.54 4.04 4.78 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.54 4.05 4.31 **** 4.05 4.	-	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	***	****	4.10	4.06	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 219 **** **** 4.44 4.44 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 215 **** **** 4.35 4.21 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.18 4.04 **** Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.58 4.50 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 82 **** 4.50 4.52 4.59 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 82 **** 5.00 4.47 4.60 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 29 0 0 0 2 2 1 4.33 ****/ 80 **** 4.00 4.47 4.65 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 82 **** 2.50 4.16 4.08 **** 5. Did gou clearly understand your evaluation criteria 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.04 4.78 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.05 4.31 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.56 4.30 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.56 4.30 ****		33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance  33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 215 **** **** 4.35 4.21 ****  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.18 4.04 ****    Seminar			0		0	0	1	0	4.00		****	****	4.44		***
Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.58 4.50 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 82 **** 4.50 4.52 4.59 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 82 **** 5.00 4.47 4.60 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 29 0 0 0 2 2 1 3.80 ****/ 80 **** 2.50 4.16 4.08 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 82 **** 4.04 4.78 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.04 4.78 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.05 4.31 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.58 4.52 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.58 4.52 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.56 4.30 ****							1	0			****	****			***
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.58 4.50 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 82 **** 4.50 4.52 4.59 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 78 **** 5.00 4.47 4.60 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 29 0 0 0 2 2 1 3.80 ****/ 80 **** 4.00 4.47 4.65 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 82 **** 2.50 4.16 4.08 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.04 4.78 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.05 4.31 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.75 4.63 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 37 **** 4.58 4.52 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.56 4.30 ****  Self Paced		33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	***	****	4.18	4.04	***
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.58 4.50 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 82 **** 4.50 4.52 4.59 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 78 **** 5.00 4.47 4.60 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 29 0 0 0 2 2 1 3.80 ****/ 80 **** 4.00 4.47 4.65 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 82 **** 2.50 4.16 4.08 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.04 4.78 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.05 4.31 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.75 4.63 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 37 **** 4.58 4.52 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.56 4.30 ****  Self Paced	Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 82 **** 4.50 4.52 4.59 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 78 **** 5.00 4.47 4.60 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 29 0 0 0 2 2 1 3.80 ****/ 80 **** 4.00 4.47 4.65 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 82 **** 2.50 4.16 4.08 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.04 4.78 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 53 **** *** 4.05 4.31 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** *** 4.75 4.63 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.56 4.30 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.56 4.30 ****  Self Paced		21	Λ	Λ	Λ	Λ	2	1	1 22	****/ 25	****	5 00	1 50	4 50	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 29 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 78 **** 5.00 4.47 4.60 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.04 4.78 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.05 4.31 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.75 4.63 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 33 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.58 4.52 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.56 4.30 ****  Self Paced			-				_	_		,					
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 29 0 0 0 2 2 1 3.80 **** 4.00 4.47 4.65 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 **** 82 **** 2.50 4.16 4.08 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 52 **** **** 4.04 4.78 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 53 **** **** 4.05 4.31 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 42 **** **** 4.75 4.63 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 37 **** **** 4.58 4.52 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 32 **** **** 4.56 4.30 ****							_	_		, -					
5. Were criteria for grading made clear  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.04 4.78 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.05 4.31 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.75 4.63 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.58 4.52 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.56 4.30 ****  Self Paced								_		,					
Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.04 4.78 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.05 4.31 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.75 4.63 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.58 4.52 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.56 4.30 ****  Self Paced	<u>-</u>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.04 4.78 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.05 4.31 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.75 4.63 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.58 4.52 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.56 4.30 ****	5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3 L	U	U	U	U	2	Τ	4.33	****/ 82	^ ^ ^ ^	2.50	4.16	4.08	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.05 4.31 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 *** **** 4.75 4.63 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.58 4.52 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.56 4.30 ****  Self Paced															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.75 4.63 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.58 4.52 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.56 4.30 ****  Self Paced								0	4.00	, 52			4.04	4.78	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.58 4.52 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.56 4.30 ****  Self Paced	2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.56 4.30 ****  Self Paced	3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	***
Self Paced	4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	
	5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	***
	Self Paced														
		33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	***

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	21	****	****	4.52	5.00	***

Title TV IN AMERICAN CULTURE

Instructor:

HUMMEL, MICHAEL

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 34 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 73 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	14	Required for Majors	9	 Graduate	0	Major	10	
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	13							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	11	С	4	General	14	Under-grad	34	Non-major	24	
84-150	18	3.00-3.49	7	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	12					
				?	0							

University of Maryland

AMER SOCY & CULT IN FI Baltimore Cou

Instructor: TAYLOR, DABRINA

Enrollment: 36
Ouestionnaires: 27

Title

Baltimore County
Fall 2007

Page 74 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	27	Student	Course	${\tt Evaluation}$	Questionnaire
				_	

			Fre	Frequencies			Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	8	7	11	4.04	1117/1639	4.04	4.41	4.27	4.28	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	12	9	3.96	1158/1639	3.96	4.31	4.22	4.20	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1175/1397	3.75	4.38	4.28	4.26	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	10	13	4.31	741/1583	4.31	4.47	4.19	4.24	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	11	13	4.33	506/1532	4.33	4.38	4.01	4.05	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	4	10	9	4.00	824/1504	4.00	4.41	4.05	4.12	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	4	7		4.40	632/1612	4.40	4.31	4.16	4.12	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	8	18		1101/1635	4.56	4.55	4.65	4.66	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	6	11	5	3.95	972/1579	3.95	4.40	4.08	4.07	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	5	7	12	4.29	1061/1518	4.29	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	597/1520	4.88	4.90	4.70	4.68	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	2	9		4.17	973/1517	4.17	4.49	4.27	4.23	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	6	8	9		1215/1550	3.81	3.80	4.22	4.20	3.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	109/1295	4.80	4.30	3.94	3.95	4.80
or bla addressed cooming contained four andersonnaing	_	ŭ	Ü	Ū	Ū	J		1.00	100/1200	1.00	1.50	3.71	3.75	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	3	5	10	4.21	660/1398	4.21	4.45	4.07	4.13	4.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	356/1391	4.79	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	509/1388	4.65	4.65	4.28	4.34	4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	8	13	2	0	0	0	4	3.67	****/ 958	***	4.14	3.93	3.97	****
- 1														
Laboratory	0.6	0	_	0	0	-1	_	4 00	**** ( 0.40	****	****	4 11	4 00	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	^ ^ ^ ^	^ ^ ^ ^	4.35	4.21	^ ^ ^ ^
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	***	2.50	4.16	4.08	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	***
Self Paced	0.5	•	•	•	•		•	4 00		4.4.4.4	4.4.4.7	4 45	- 06	
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 50	***	****	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	***		4.51	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 32 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.37 5.00 \*\*\*\* 26

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 26 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 21 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.52 5.00 \*\*\*\* Course-Section: AMST 322 0101

Title AMER SOCY & CULT IN FI

Instructor:

TAYLOR, DABRINA

Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 27 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 74 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	rned Cum. GPA			d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	С	5	General	9	Under-grad	27	Non-major	17
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

University of Maryland

Baltimore County Title STUDIES IN POPULAR CUL SNYDER, DONALD

Fall 2007

Page 75 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 29

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questi	onnaire
----------------------------------	---------

		Frequencies					Instructor		ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
	General														
	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	5		11	4.21			4.41		4.28	4.21
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	9	14	4.37	722/1639	4.37	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.37
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	18	4.54	487/1397	4.54	4.38	4.28	4.26	4.54
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	6	19	4.54	444/1583	4.54	4.47	4.19	4.24	4.54
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	6	16	4.41	441/1532	4.41	4.38	4.01	4.05	4.41
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	8	15	4.37	514/1504	4.37	4.41	4.05	4.12	4.37
	Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	7	18	4.59	398/1612	4.59	4.31	4.16	4.12	4.59
	How many times was class cancelled	3	0	1	0	0	8	17		1114/1635	4.54	4.55	4.65	4.66	4.54
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	14	8	4.30	601/1579	4.30	4.40	4.08	4.07	4.30
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	10	16	4.56	745/1518	4.56	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.56
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	699/1520	4.85	4.90	4.70	4.68	4.85
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	8	15	4.41		4.41	4.49	4.27	4.23	4.41
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	11	14	4.44		4.44	3.80	4.22	4.20	4.44
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	8	20		155/1295		4.30	3.94	3.95	4.71
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	2	8	9	4.14	708/1398	4.14	4.45	4.07	4.13	4.14
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	1	4	16	4.43	670/1391	4.43	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.43
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	578/1388	4.59	4.65	4.28	4.34	4.59
4.	Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	349/ 958	4.25	4.14	3.93	3.97	4.25
	Laboratory														
1	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.06	****
	Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 240	***	****	4.10	4.08	****
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 219	***	****	4.11	4.08	***
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 215	***	****	4.44	4.44	***
	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 198	***	****	4.18	4.04	***
٥.	were requirements for rap reports crearry specifica	20	U	U	O	U		O	4.00	/ 100			4.10	1.01	
	Seminar														
1.	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	***
2.	Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	4.59	***
3.	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	***
4.	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	4.65	***
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	***	2.50	4.16	4.08	***
	Field Work														
1	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 53	***	***	4.05	4.78	***
	Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 42	***	****	4.05	4.63	***
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities				0	0	0	1	0		****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****
J. Did conferences help you carry out fred activities				,	3	3	_	J	1.00	, 32			1.50	1.50	
	Self Paced														
1.	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful								4.00 ****/						
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

Course-Section: AMST 325 0101

Title STUDIES IN POPULAR CUL

Instructor:

SNYDER, DONALD

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 29 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 75 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned Cum. GPA			Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	 А	10	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	7	Under-grad	29	Non-major	25
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: AMST 357 0101

SP TOPICS: COMM, MEDIA, A

SNYDER, DONALD (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 76 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 33

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	:S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	8	12	11	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	4.41	4.27	4.28	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	7	10	12		1262/1639		4.31	4.22	4.20	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	1	4	1	5	7		1190/1397		4.38	4.28	4.26	3.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	4	2	13	13	4.09	946/1583	4.09	4.47	4.19	4.24	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	6	13	8	3.77	1023/1532	3.77	4.38	4.01	4.05	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	7	11	11	4.03	807/1504	4.03	4.41	4.05	4.12	4.03
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	6	3	5	17	3.97	1096/1612	3.97	4.31	4.16	4.12	3.97
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	21	9		1402/1635		4.55	4.65	4.66	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	3	16	6	4.12	806/1579	4.12	4.40	4.08	4.07	4.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	4	1	13	13	4.13	1189/1518	4.13	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	6	25	4.75	890/1520	4.75	4.90	4.70	4.68	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	4	12	13	4.09	1030/1517	4.09	4.49	4.27	4.23	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	4	11	14	4.13	1010/1550	3.21	3.80	4.22	4.20	3.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	2	3	9	15	4.06	595/1295	4.06	4.30	3.94	3.95	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	3	3	7	14	3.97	816/1398	3.97	4.45	4.07	4.13	3.97
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	6	7	14	4.10	936/1391	4.10	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	5	6	18	4.37	764/1388	4.37	4.65	4.28	4.34	4.37
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	3	0	11	6	6	3.46	742/ 958	3.46	4.14	3.93	3.97	3.46
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	4.59	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	2.50	4.16	4.08	****
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	***
Frequ	iency	nie:	trib	ıt i o	n									
-	iciicy	DID	CIID	2010										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 19		Red	quire	ed f	or M	ajor	`s	4	Graduat	<b></b> e	0	Majo	or	4
28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 12				_						_	_			_

Credits E	Earned	rned Cum. GPA			d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	19	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	21	Under-grad	33	Non-major	29
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 357 0101

011, 11,101, 22, 0101

Title SP TOPICS:COMM,MEDIA,A Instructor: (Instr. D)

Instructor:
Enrollment: 40

Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2007

Page 77 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

General  Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  1 0 1 0 8 12 11 4.00 1138/1639 4.00 4.41 4.27 4.28 4.20 13 13 4.00 1138/1639 4.00 4.41 4.27 4.28 4.20 13 13 4.00 1138/1639 4.00 4.41 4.27 4.28 4.20 13 13 4.00 1138/1639 4.00 4.41 4.27 4.28 4.20 13 13 4.00 1138/1639 4.00 4.41 4.27 4.28 4.20 13 13 4.00 1138/1639 4.00 4.41 4.27 4.28 4.20 13 13 4.00 1138/1639 4.00 4.41 4.27 4.28 4.20 13 13 4.00 1138/1639 4.00 4.41 4.27 4.28 4.20 13 13 4.00 1138/1639 4.00 4.41 4.22 4.20 13 13 4.00 1138/1639 4.00 4.47 4.19 4.24 4.20 13 13 4.00 946/1538 4.09 4.47 4.19 4.24 4.20 13 13 4.00 946/1538 4.09 4.47 4.19 4.24 4.20 13 13 4.00 946/1538 4.09 4.47 4.19 4.24 4.20 13 13 4.00 946/1538 4.09 4.47 4.19 4.24 4.20 13 13 4.00 946/1538 4.09 4.47 4.19 4.24 4.20 13 13 4.00 946/1538 4.09 4.47 4.19 4.24 4.20 13 13 4.00 946/1538 4.09 4.47 4.19 4.24 4.20 13 13 4.00 946/1538 4.09 4.47 4.19 4.24 4.20 13 13 4.00 946/1538 4.09 4.47 4.19 4.24 4.20 13 13 4.00 946/1538 4.20 4.20 4.20 13 13 4.20 94 4.						ncie	s			tructor		Dept		Level	Sec
Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 1 0 8 12 11 4.00 1138/1639 4.00 4.41 4.27 4.28 4 10 114 the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 4 7 10 12 3.91 1262/1639 3.91 4.31 4.22 4.20 13 Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 15 1 4 1 5 7 3.72 1190/1397 3.72 4.38 4.28 4.26 13 Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 4 2 13 3 4.09 846/1583 4.09 4.47 4.19 4.24 4.01 Did sasinged readings contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 3 6 13 8 3.77 1023/1592 3.77 4.38 4.01 4.05 12 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 1 1 0 7 11 11 4.03 807/1504 4.03 4.41 4.05 4.12 4.09 Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 6 3 5 17 3.97 1096/1612 3.97 4.31 4.16 4.12 18 How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 1 1 21 9 4.19 1402/1635 4.19 4.55 4.65 4.66 4.10 Would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 32 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0.0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 1 0 8 12 11 4.00 1138/1639 4.00 4.41 4.27 4.28 4 10 114 the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 4 7 10 12 3.91 1262/1639 3.91 4.31 4.22 4.20 13 Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 15 1 4 1 5 7 3.72 1190/1397 3.72 4.38 4.28 4.26 13 Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 4 2 13 3 4.09 846/1583 4.09 4.47 4.19 4.24 4.01 Did sasinged readings contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 3 6 13 8 3.77 1023/1592 3.77 4.38 4.01 4.05 12 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 1 1 0 7 11 11 4.03 807/1504 4.03 4.41 4.05 4.12 4.09 Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 6 3 5 17 3.97 1096/1612 3.97 4.31 4.16 4.12 18 How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 1 1 21 9 4.19 1402/1635 4.19 4.55 4.65 4.66 4.10 Would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 32 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0.0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Canaral														
Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 4 7 10 12 3.91 1262/1639 3.91 4.31 4.22 4.20 2 Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 15 1 4 1 5 7 3.72 1190/1397 3.72 4.38 4.28 4.26 2 Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 4 2 13 13 4.09 946/1583 4.09 4.47 4.19 4.24 4 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 3 6 13 8 3.77 1023/1532 3.77 4.38 4.28 4.26 2 Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 4 2 13 13 4.09 946/1583 4.09 4.47 4.19 4.24 4 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 3 6 13 8 3.77 1023/1532 3.77 4.38 4.10 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.10 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.10 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.10 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.10 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.10 4.05 4.10 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.10 4.05 4.10 4.05 4.10 4.05 4.10 4.05 4.10 4.05 4.10 4.05 4.10 4.05 4.10 4.05 4.10 4.05 4.10 4.05 4.10 4.05 4.10 4.05 4.10 4.05 4.10 4.05 4.10 4.05 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10		1	0	1	0	8	12	11	4 00	1138/1639	4 00	4 41	4 27	4 28	4.0
Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 15 1 4 1 5 7 3.72 1190/1397 3.72 4.38 4.28 4.26 5 10d other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 4 2 13 13 4.09 946/1583 4.09 4.47 4.19 4.24 4.04 5 10d assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 3 6 13 8 3.77 1023/1532 3.77 4.38 4.01 4.05 3 10d written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 1 1 0 7 11 11 4.03 807/1504 4.03 4.41 4.05 4.01 4.02 4.03 4.04 4.04 4.04 4.05 3 10d written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 1 1 0 7 11 11 4.03 807/1504 4.03 4.41 4.05 4.12 4.04 Max the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 6 3 5 17 3.97 1096/1612 3.97 4.31 4.16 4.12 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.06 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.06 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.06 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.06 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.06 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.06 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.06 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.06 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05		_	Ū	Û	4	•									3.9
Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 4 2 13 13 4.09 946/1583 4.09 4.47 4.19 4.24 4.05 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 3 6 13 8 3.77 1032/1523 3.77 4.38 4.01 4.05 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 1 1 0 7 11 11 4.03 807/1504 4.03 4.41 4.05 4.12 4 Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 6 3 5 17 3.97 1096/1612 3.97 4.31 4.16 4.12 4 Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 1 1 2 1 9 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.01 4.10 4.12 4 4.00 4.08 4.07 4.12 4.00 would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 32 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1579 4.12 4.40 4.08 4.07 4.12 4.00 would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 32 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			-	-	4	1		7							3.7
Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 3 6 13 8 3.77 1023/1532 3.77 4.38 4.01 4.05 2.01 d written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 1 1 0 7 11 11 4.03 807/1504 4.03 4.41 4.05 4.12 4 Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 6 3 5 17 3.97 1096/1612 3.97 4.31 4.16 4.12 3 How many times was class cancelled 1 0 1 6 3 5 17 3.97 1096/1612 3.97 4.31 4.16 4.12 3 How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 1 1 2 1 9 4.19 1402/1635 4.19 4.55 4.65 4.66 4 4.07 4 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 32 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1579 4.12 4.40 4.08 4.07 4 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 32 0 0 0 1 0 0 2.50 ****/1518 4.13 4.58 4.63 4.07 4 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 32 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1520 4.75 4.09 4.70 4.68 4.07 4 How would you grade the overall prepared 31 0 0 1 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1520 4.75 4.09 4.70 4.68 4.00 1 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1520 4.75 4.09 4.70 4.68 4.00 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1520 4.75 4.09 4.70 4.68 4.00 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1520 4.75 4.09 4.70 4.68 4.00 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1520 4.75 4.09 4.70 4.68 4.00 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1520 4.75 4.09 4.70 4.68 4.00 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1520 4.75 4.09 4.70 4.68 4.00 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1520 4.75 4.09 4.70 4.68 4.00 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1520 4.75 4.09 4.70 4.68 4.00 4.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0				_	4	2	_	13		,					4.0
Did written assignments contribute to what you learned was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 1 0 7 11 11 4.03 807/1504 4.03 4.41 4.05 4.12 4.84 4.05 4.12 4.85 4.65 4.66 4.85 4.66 4.85 4.66 4.85 4.66 4.85 4.85 4.85 4.85 4.85 4.85 4.85 4.85				-	-	_									3.
## Was the grading system clearly explained			1	_	_	-									4.
How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 1 1 21 9 4.19 1402/1635 4.19 4.55 4.66 4.66 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 32 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1579 4.12 4.40 4.08 4.07 4.09 4.00 ****/1579 4.12 4.40 4.08 4.07 4.09 4.00 ****/1579 4.12 4.40 4.08 4.07 4.09 4.00 ****/1579 4.12 4.40 4.08 4.07 4.09 4.00 ****/1579 4.12 4.40 4.08 4.07 4.09 4.00 ****/1579 4.12 4.40 4.08 4.07 4.09 4.00 ****/1579 4.12 4.40 4.08 4.07 4.09 4.00 ****/1579 4.12 4.40 4.08 4.07 4.09 4.00 ****/1579 4.12 4.40 4.08 4.07 4.09 4.00 4.00 ****/1579 4.12 4.40 4.08 4.07 4.09 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 ****/1579 4.12 4.40 4.08 4.07 4.09 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00			0	_	-	-									3.
Lecture   Lecture   Were the instructor's lectures well prepared   31 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/1518 4.13 4.58 4.43 4.39 4 10 dthe instructor's lectures well prepared   31 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/1518 4.13 4.58 4.43 4.39 4 10 dthe instructor seem interested in the subject   32 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1520 4.75 4.90 4.70 4.68 4 10 dthe lectures contribute to what you learned   26 2 0 4 0 1 0 2.40 ****/1550 3.21 3.80 4.22 4.20 3		_	•	_	-	_	_	9							4.
Lecture  Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 31 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/1518 4.13 4.58 4.43 4.39 4 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 32 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1550 3.21 3.80 4.22 4.20 3 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 26 2 0 4 0 1 0 2.40 ****/1550 3.21 3.80 4.22 4.20 3 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 2 3 3 7 14 3.97 816/1398 3.97 4.45 4.07 4.13 4 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 1 1 6 7 14 4.10 936/1391 4.10 4.61 4.30 4.35 4 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 5 6 18 4.37 764/1388 4.37 4.65 4.28 4.34 4 Were special techniques successful 4 3 3 0 11 6 6 3.46 742/958 3.46 4.14 3.93 3.97 3 Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.58 4.50 ** Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 82 **** 4.50 4.52 4.59 ** Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 4.50 4.47 4.60 ** Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 4.00 4.47 4.66 ** Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 1 1 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 4.00 4.47 4.66 ** Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 4.00 4.47 4.66 ** Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 4.00 4.47 4.66 ** Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 4.00 4.47 4.66 ** Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 4.00 4.47 4.66 ** Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 4.00 4.47 4.66 ** Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 4.00 4.47 4.66 ** Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 4.00 4.47 4.66 ** Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 4.00 4.47 4.60 ** Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			•	•	_	_		0							
Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 31 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/1518 4.13 4.58 4.43 4.39 4.39 doing the instructor seem interested in the subject 32 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1520 4.75 4.90 4.70 4.68 4.30 doing the lectures contribute to what you learned 26 2 0 4 0 1 0 2.40 ****/1550 3.21 3.80 4.22 4.20 3 doing to be a contribute to what you learned 4 0 2 3 3 7 14 3.97 816/1398 3.97 4.45 4.07 4.13 3 doing the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 5 6 18 4.37 764/1388 4.37 4.65 4.28 4.34 4 doing the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 3 3 0 11 6 6 3.46 742/958 3.46 4.14 3.93 3.97 3 doing the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 3 3 0 11 6 6 3.46 742/958 3.46 4.14 3.93 3.97 3 doing the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 3 3 0 11 6 6 3.46 742/958 3.46 4.14 3.93 3.97 3 doing the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 3 3 0 11 6 6 3.46 742/958 3.46 4.14 3.93 3.97 3 doing the instructor available for individual attention 31 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.58 4.50 *** Mas the instructor available for individual attention 31 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.57 4.65 *** Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.50 ****/ 80 **** 5.00 4.47 4.65 *** Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.50 ****/ 80 **** 5.00 4.47 4.65 *** Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.50 ****/ 82 **** 5.00 4.47 4.65 *** Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.50 ****/ 82 **** 5.00 4.47 4.65 *** Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 5.00 4.47 4.65 *** Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 5.00 4.47 4.65 *** Here are also between the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 32 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 5.00 4.47 4.65 *** Type **** 5.00 4.88 **** 5.00 4.97 4.65 **** 5.00 **** 5.00 **** 5.00 **** 5.00 ***** 5.00 **** 5.00 **** 5.00 **** 5.00 **** 5.00 **** 5.00 **** 5.00 **** 5.00 **** 5.00 **** 5.00 **** 5.00 **** 5.00 **** 5.00 **	. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	U	U	U	U		U	4.00	/13/9	7.12	1.10	1.00	4.07	ч.
Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 32 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1520 4.75 4.90 4.70 4.68 4.00 did the lectures contribute to what you learned 26 2 0 4 0 1 0 2.40 ****/1550 3.21 3.80 4.22 4.20 3.20 did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 2 3 3 7 14 3.97 816/1398 3.97 4.45 4.07 4.13 3.20 discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 1 1 6 7 14 4.10 936/1391 4.10 4.61 4.30 4.35 discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 1 5 6 18 4.37 764/1388 4.37 4.65 4.28 4.34 4.30 discussions discussion and open discussion 3 0 0 1 5 6 18 4.37 764/1388 4.37 4.65 4.28 4.34 4.30 discussions discussions discussion 3 0 0 1 5 6 18 4.37 764/1388 4.37 4.65 4.28 4.34 4.30 discussions discussion discussion 3 0 0 1 5 6 18 4.37 764/1388 4.37 4.65 4.28 4.34 4.30 discussions discussion discussion 3 0 0 1 5 6 18 4.37 764/1388 4.37 4.65 4.28 4.34 4.30 discussions discussion discussion discussion 3 0 1 1 6 6 3.46 742/958 3.46 4.14 3.93 3.97 3.97 3.97 3.97 3.97 3.97 3.97	Lecture														
Discussion  Discussion  Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 2 3 3 3 7 14 3.97 816/1398 3.97 4.45 4.07 4.13 3 80 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	31	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1518	4.13	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.
Discussion  Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 2 3 3 7 14 3.97 816/1398 3.97 4.45 4.07 4.13 3 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1520	4.75	4.90	4.70	4.68	4.
Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 2 3 3 7 14 3.97 816/1398 3.97 4.45 4.07 4.13 22 4 1	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	2	0	4	0	1	0	2.40	****/1550	3.21	3.80	4.22	4.20	3 .
Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 2 3 3 7 14 3.97 816/1398 3.97 4.45 4.07 4.13 22 4 1	Discussion														
Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 1 1 6 7 14 4.10 936/1391 4.10 4.61 4.30 4.35 4 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 5 6 18 4.37 764/1388 4.37 4.65 4.28 4.34 4 Were special techniques successful 4 3 3 0 11 6 6 3.46 742/958 3.46 4.14 3.93 3.97 3    Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ***/ 85 **** 5.00 4.58 4.50 * Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ***/ 82 **** 4.50 4.52 4.59 * Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 ***/ 78 **** 5.00 4.47 4.60 * Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.50 ***/ 80 **** 4.00 4.47 4.65 * Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 ***/ 82 **** 2.50 4.16 4.08 * Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 ***/ 82 **** 4.37 5.00 **  Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 32 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 32 **** 4.37 5.00 **  Frequency Distribution  Edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors		4	0	2	3	3	7	14	3 97	816/1398	3 97	4 45	4 07	4 13	3.
Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 5 6 18 4.37 764/1388 4.37 4.65 4.28 4.34 4   Were special techniques successful 4 3 3 0 11 6 6 3.46 742/958 3.46 4.14 3.93 3.97 3    Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.58 4.50 **  Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 82 **** 4.50 4.52 4.59 **  Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 78 **** 5.00 4.47 4.60 **  Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 80 **** 4.00 4.47 4.65 **  Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 2.50 4.16 4.08 **  Self Paced  Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 32 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.37 5.00 **  Frequency Distribution  Edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	-		-	1	_		7								4.
Seminar   Seminar   Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   31   0   0   0   1   1   0   3.50   ****   85   ****   5.00   4.58   4.50   **   4.50				_	_	-	6								
Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.58 4.50 * Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 82 **** 4.50 4.52 4.59 * Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 78 **** 5.00 4.47 4.60 * Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 80 **** 4.00 4.47 4.65 * Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 2.50 4.16 4.08 * Self Paced  Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 32 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.37 5.00 **  Frequency Distribution  edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	. Were special techniques successful			-	_		_			. ,					
Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.58 4.50 * Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 82 **** 4.50 4.52 4.59 * Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 78 **** 5.00 4.47 4.60 * Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 80 **** 4.00 4.47 4.65 * Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 2.50 4.16 4.08 * Self Paced  Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 32 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.37 5.00 **  Frequency Distribution  edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors															
Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 82 **** 4.50 4.52 4.59 * Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 78 **** 5.00 4.47 4.60 * Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 80 **** 4.00 4.47 4.65 * Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 2.50 4.16 4.08 *  Self Paced  Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 32 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.37 5.00 *  Frequency Distribution  edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors		21	0	0	0	1	1	0	2 E O	****/ 05	****	E 00	/ E0	4 50	* *
Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 78 **** 5.00 4.47 4.60 *Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 80 **** 4.00 4.47 4.65 *Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 80 **** 4.00 4.47 4.65 *Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 1 0 3.50 ****/ 82 **** 4.00 4.47 4.65 *Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 1 0 3.50 ****/ 82 **** 4.00 4.47 4.65 *Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 1 0 3.50 ****/ 82 **** 4.00 4.47 4.65 *Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 1 0 3.50 ****/ 82 **** 4.00 4.47 4.65 *Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 1 0 3.50 ****/ 82 **** 4.00 4.47 4.65 *Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 1 0 3.50 ****/ 82 **** 4.00 4.47 4.65 *Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 1 0 3.50 ****/ 82 **** 4.00 4.47 4.65 *Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 1 0 3.50 ****/ 82 **** 4.00 4.47 4.65 *Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.50 ****/ 82 **** 4.00 4.47 4.65 *Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 4.00 4.47 4.65 *Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 4.00 4.47 4.65 *Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 4.00 4.47 4.65 *Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 4.00 4.47 4.65 *Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 4.00 4.47 4.65 *Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 4.37 5.00 ***  *******************************	9 -		•	U	•	_	1	0		,					* *
Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 80 **** 4.00 4.47 4.65 * Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 2.50 4.16 4.08 *  Self Paced  Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 32 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.37 5.00 *  Frequency Distribution  edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors								0		, -					* *
Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 2.50 4.16 4.08 *  Self Paced  Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 32 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.37 5.00 *  Frequency Distribution  edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors			-	-	_	-	_	0		, -					* *
Self Paced  Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 32 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.37 5.00 *  Frequency Distribution  edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors				-	-	_	_	0		,					*:
Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 32 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.37 5.00 *  Frequency Distribution  edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	U	U	Τ	U	1	U	3.00	^^^^/ 82	* * * *	2.50	4.16	4.08	^ ′
Frequency Distribution edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	Self Paced														
edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	***	4.37	5.00	* *
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Freq	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	5
0-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 19														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	19	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	21	Under-grad	33	Non-major	29
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant -	
				I	0	Other	4	_			
				າ	0						

Course-Section: AMST 380 0101

COMMUNITY IN AMERICA

Title COMMUNITY IN AME Instructor: ORSER, EDWARD W

Enrollment: 34
Questionnaires: 29

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 78 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

				Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	-	Mean	Mean	Mean
	**************************************														
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	20	4.59	529/1639	4.59	4.41	4.27	4.28	4.59
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	20	4.66	360/1639	4.66	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.66
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	22	4.69	350/1397	4.69	4.38	4.28	4.26	4.69
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	4	4	19	4.46	524/1583	4.46	4.47	4.19	4.24	4.46
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	137/1532	4.83	4.38	4.01	4.05	4.83
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	22	4.62	275/1504	4.62	4.41	4.05	4.12	4.62
	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	6	18	4.45	575/1612	4.45	4.31	4.16	4.12	4.45
8.		1	0	0	0	0	6	22	4.79	840/1635	4.79	4.55	4.65	4.66	4.79
	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	7		4.40	496/1579		4.40	4.08		4.40
										,					
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	2	25	4.76	454/1518	4.76	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.76
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	382/1520	4.93	4.90	4.70	4.68	4.93
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	3	23	4.69	382/1517	4.69	4.49	4.27	4.23	4.69
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	26	4.83	265/1550	4.83	3.80	4.22	4.20	4.83
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	6	19	4.57	234/1295	4.57		3.94		4.57
٥.	bia additionibual econoliques contained your understanding	O	_	O	O	5	O	17	1.57	231/12/3	1.57	1.50	3.71	3.75	1.57
	Discussion														
1	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	349/1398	4.64	4.45	4.07	4.13	4.64
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	3	3	16	4.59	550/1391	4.59	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.59
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	509/1388	4.65	4.65	4.28	4.34	4.65
	4. Were special techniques successful				2	3	4	11	4.20	380/ 958	4.20	4.14	3.93		4.20
т.	were special techniques successiul	7	2	0	4	5	-		7.20	300/ 930	1.20	1.11	3.93	3.91	4.20
	Laboratory														
2	Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****
۷.	were you provided with adequate background information	20	U	U	U	U	U		3.00	/ 240			T.11	T.00	
	Seminar														
2	Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	4.59	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	4.65	****
	Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	***	2.50	4.16	4.08	****
٥.	were criteria for grading made crear	20	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 62		2.50	4.10	4.00	
	Field Work														
1	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	***	****	4.04	4.78	****
3.		28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	***	4.75	4.63	****
		28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.75	4.53	****
	4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations			0	0	0	0	1			***	****			****
э.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	****/ 32		* * * *	4.56	4.30	
	Colf Darad														
1	Self Paced  1. Did celf-paced system contribute to what you learned			0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/	****	****	4 4 5	E 00	****
	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28 28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 50	****	~ ~ ~ ~	4.45	5.00	****
	2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32 ****/	****	****	4.51	5.00	****
	3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful				0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	***	****	4.37	5.00	****
5.	Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	***	***	4.52	5.00	***

Course-Section: AMST 380 0101

Title COMMUNITY IN AMERICA

Instructor: ORSER, EDWARD W

Enrollment: 34
Questionnaires: 29

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 78 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected G	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A 8	3	Required for Majors	9	 Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 13	3						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	4	C 4	<u>l</u>	General	6	Under-grad	29	Non-major	25
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	D 0	)						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	)	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P 0	)			responses to	be sid	nificant	
				I 0	)	Other	7	-			
				? 2	2						

Course-Section: AMST 391 0101

STUDIES IN AMERICAN CU

Title

BELASCO, WARREN Instructor:

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 15

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 79 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaire

				Fre	eaner	ncies	:		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
	General														
	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	754/1639	4.53	4.41	4.27	4.28	4.40
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	486/1639	4.67	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.53
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	323/1397	4.71	4.38	4.28	4.26	4.71
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	260/1583	4.80	4.47	4.19	4.24	4.73
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	190/1532	4.73	4.38	4.01	4.05	4.73
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	416/1504	4.60	4.41	4.05	4.12	4.47
	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	317/1612	4.67	4.31	4.16	4.12	4.67
	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	913/1635	4.63	4.55	4.65	4.66	4.73
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	496/1579	4.47	4.40	4.08	4.07	4.40
	Lecture														
1	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	629/1518	4.71	4 58	4.43	4.39	4.64
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	437/1520	4.93	4.90	4.70	4.68	4.93
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	648/1517	4.66	4.49	4.27	4.23	4.46
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	1	11	4.50	638/1550	4.68	3.80	4.22	4.20	4.50
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	10		197/1295	4.68	4.30	3.94	3.95	4.64
٥.	bid additivistal techniques chilance your understanding		O	U	O		J	10	1.01	101/1200	4.00	4.50	3.74	3.75	1.01
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	145/1398	4.92	4.45	4.07	4.13	4.92
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	393/1391	4.77	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.75
3.	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	296/1388	4.85	4.65	4.28	4.34	4.83
	Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	190/ 958	4.50	4.14	3.93	3.97	4.56
	Laboratory														
	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.06	****
	Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****
5.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	***	****	4.18	4.04	***
	Seminar														
1.	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	***	5.00	4.58	4.50	***
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	4.59	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	4.65	****
	Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	***	2.50	4.16	4.08	****
	Dield March														
1	Field Work	1 /	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 52	***	****	4 04	1 70	****
	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1 1	•		, 52			4.04 4.05	4.78	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0			1	0		****/ 53 ****/ 42	****	****		4.31	****
	Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 42 ****/ 37	****	****	4.75 4.58	4.63 4.52	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14		0	0	0	0	1		****/ 3/ ****/ 32	****	****			****
э.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	/ 32			4.56	4.30	
	Self Paced														
2.	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	***	****	4.51	5.00	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	32	****	***	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

Course-Section: AMST 391 0101

Title STUDIES IN AMERICAN CU

Instructor: BELASCO, WARREN

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 79 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	7
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	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 391 0201

STUDIES IN AMERICAN CU

Instructor: BELASCO, WARREN

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 15

Title

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 80 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	430/1639	4.53	4.41	4.27	4.28	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	199/1639	4.67	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	0	0	2		****/1397		4.38	4.28	4.26	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	160/1583	4.80	4.47	4.19	4.24	4.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	190/1532	4.73	4.38	4.01	4.05	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	195/1504	4.60	4.41	4.05	4.12	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	317/1612	4.67	4.31	4.16	4.12	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1114/1635	4.63	4.55	4.65	4.66	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	352/1579	4.47	4.40	4.08	4.07	4.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	397/1518	4.71	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	437/1520	4.93	4.90	4.70	4.68	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	198/1517		4.49	4.27	4.23	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	231/1550	4.68	3.80	4.22	4.20	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	155/1295		4.30	3.94	3.95	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	129/1398	4.92	4.45	4.07	4.13	4.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	356/1391	4.77	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	276/1388		4.65	4.28	4.34	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	240/ 958	4.50	4.14	3.93	3.97	4.44

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there a	are not enougl	n
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 420 0101

SEMINAR: COMM/MEDIA/ART

SCHALLER, THOMA (Instr. A)

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 81 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 16

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Out and down	MD	3.7.7		-	ncies		-		ructor	Course	-	-	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	404/1639	4.69	4.41	4.27	4.42	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	722/1639	4.38	4.31	4.22	4.29	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	239/1583	4.75	4.47	4.19	4.31	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	141/1532	4.81	4.38	4.01	4.07	4.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	275/1504	4.63	4.41	4.05	4.20	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	7	5	3.88	1198/1612	3.88	4.31	4.16	4.18	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.55	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	167/1579	4.88	4.40	4.08	4.21	4.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	301/1518	4.86	4.58	4.43	4.51	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	371/1517	4.78	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	139/1550	4.79	3.80	4.22	4.24	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	135/1295	4.73	4.30	3.94	4.01	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	294/1398	4.71	4.45	4.07	4.23	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	0	13	4.71	441/1391	4.71	4.61	4.30	4.48	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	771/1388	4.36	4.65	4.28	4.50	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	75/ 958	4.91	4.14	3.93	4.24	4.91
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	4.49	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78		5.00	4.47	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	4.59	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	2.50	4.16	4.02	****

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	А	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	14
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9	_		_	
				2	0						

Course-Section: AMST 420 0101

SEMINAR: COMM/MEDIA/ART

Title Instructor:

LOVIGLIO, JASON (Instr. B)

Enrollment:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 82 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	16	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Queberonnaries.	10	Deddelle	COULDC	пуатаастоп	Queberonnarie

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	404/1639	4.69	4.41	4.27	4.42	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	722/1639	4.38	4.31	4.22	4.29	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	239/1583	4.75	4.47	4.19	4.31	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	141/1532	4.81	4.38	4.01	4.07	4.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	275/1504	4.63	4.41	4.05	4.20	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	7	5	3.88	1198/1612	3.88	4.31	4.16	4.18	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.55	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1579	4.88	4.40	4.08	4.21	4.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	257/1518	4.86	4.58	4.43	4.51	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	181/1517	4.78	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	457/1550	4.79	3.80	4.22	4.24	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	155/1295	4.73	4.30	3.94	4.01	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	294/1398	4.71	4.45	4.07	4.23	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	0	13	4.71	441/1391	4.71	4.61	4.30	4.48	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	771/1388	4.36	4.65	4.28	4.50	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	75/ 958	4.91	4.14	3.93	4.24	4.91
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5 00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	4.49	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 82	***	2.50	4.16	4.02	***

Credits E	larned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	А	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	14
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: AMST 490 0101 Title SENIOR SEMINAR MCDERMOTT, PAT (Instr. A)

Instructor:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 83 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 8 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	615/1639	4.67	4.41	4.27	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	859/1639		4.31	4.22	4.29	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	367/1397	4.78	4.38	4.28	4.38	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	792/1583	4.43	4.47	4.19	4.31	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	335/1532	4.60	4.38	4.01	4.07	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	122/1504	4.85	4.41	4.05	4.20	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1612	4.93	4.31	4.16	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1135/1635	4.67	4.55	4.65	4.72	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	241/1579	4.58	4.40	4.08	4.21	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	360/1518	4.90	4.58	4.43	4.51	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	802/1520	4.90	4.90	4.70	4.75	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3		4.25	886/1517	4.63	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	1198/1550	3.83	3.80	4.22	4.24	3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	265/1295	3.75	4.30	3.94	4.01	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	329/1398	4.78	4.45	4.07	4.23	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.61	4.30	4.48	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	296/1388	4.89	4.65	4.28	4.50	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	119/ 958	4.75	4.14	3.93	4.24	4.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.83	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	47/ 82		4.50	4.52	4.49	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.56	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	58/ 80	4.00	4.00	4.47	4.59	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	79/ 82	2.50	2.50	4.16	4.02	2.50
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	***	****	4.69	4.85	***
Frequ	iencv	Dist	trib	utio	ı									
11040														

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

Course-Section: AMST 490 0101
Title SENIOR SEMINAR

SENIOR SEMINAR

(Instr. D)

 University of Maryland

Baltimore County
Fall 2007

Page 84

FEB 13, 2008
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questi	lonnaire
----------------------------------	----------

			Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	615/1639	4.67	4.41	4.27	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	859/1639	4.50	4.31	4.22	4.29	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	367/1397	4.78	4.38	4.28	4.38	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	792/1583	4.43	4.47	4.19	4.31	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	335/1532	4.60	4.38	4.01	4.07	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	122/1504	4.85	4.41	4.05	4.20	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1612	4.93	4.31	4.16	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1135/1635	4.67	4.55	4.65	4.72	4.50
Lecture														
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1550	3.83	3.80	4.22	4.24	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	329/1398	4.78	4.45	4.07	4.23	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.61	4.30	4.48	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	296/1388	4.89	4.65	4.28	4.50	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	119/ 958	4.75	4.14	3.93	4.24	4.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.83	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	47/ 82	4.50	4.50	4.52	4.49	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.56	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	58/ 80	4.00	4.00	4.47	4.59	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	79/ 82	2.50	2.50	4.16	4.02	2.50
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.85	****

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

Course-Section: AMST 490 0102
Title SENIOR SEMINAR
Instructor: CAMPBELL, DUNCA

7

Enrollment:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 85 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 5 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1639	4.67	4.41	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1639	4.50	4.31	4.22	4.29	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1397	4.78	4.38	4.28	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	186/1583	4.43	4.47	4.19	4.31	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	146/1532	4.60	4.38	4.01	4.07	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	150/1504	4.85	4.41	4.05	4.20	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	166/1612	4.93	4.31	4.16	4.18	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1635	4.67	4.55	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	382/1579	4.58	4.40	4.08	4.21	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1518	4.90	4.58	4.43	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	4.90	4.90	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1517	4.63	4.49	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1550	3.83	3.80	4.22	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1158/1295	3.75	4.30	3.94	4.01	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1398	4.78	4.45	4.07	4.23	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.61	4.30	4.48	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1388	4.89	4.65	4.28	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	4.75	4.14	3.93	4.24	***

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

Course-Section: AMST 495 0301

HONORS SEMINAR IN AMST

Instructor: BELASCO, WARREN

Title

Enrollment: 7
Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 86 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
	_	_	_	_	_	_	_							
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	814/1639	4.33	4.41	4.27	4.42	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	948/1639	4.17	4.31	4.22	4.29	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.38	4.28	4.38	***
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	697/1583	4.33	4.47	4.19	4.31	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	965/1532	3.83	4.38	4.01	4.07	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	701/1504	4.17	4.41	4.05	4.20	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1229/1612	3.83	4.31	4.16	4.18	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.55	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	283/1579	4.60	4.40	4.08	4.21	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1518	****	4.58	4.43	4.51	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1520	***	4.90	4.70	4.75	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1517	****	4.49	4.27	4.34	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1550	****	3.80	4.22	4.24	***
•														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	426/1398	4.50	4.45	4.07	4.23	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	393/1391	4.75	4.61	4.30	4.48	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			0	0	0	1	4	4.80	328/1388		4.65	4.28	4.50	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1 2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	456/ 958	4.00	4.14	3.93	4.24	4.00
i. Were special deciminates successful	2		U	U		Т	Т	4.00	130/ 330	4.00	4.14	3.93	7.24	4.00

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