Course-Section: AMST 100 0101

Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT

Instructor: BRYAN, KATHY

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 26

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 59 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Ouestions							equer			_		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	Τ	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
l. Did you	gain ne	w insights,ski	- lls fro	m this course	1	0	0	0	3	9	13	4.40	776/1649	4.25	4.50	4.28	4.11	4.40
		tor make clear			1	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	388/1648	4.43	4.53	4.23	4.16	4.64
3. Did the	exam qu	estions reflect	t the e	xpected goals	1	15	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	464/1375	4.51	4.50	4.27	4.10	4.60
1. Did oth	er evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	1	1	0	1	7	15	4.46	566/1595	4.28	4.56	4.20	4.03	4.46
. Did ass	igned re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	10	13	4.40	476/1533	4.34	4.48	4.04	3.87	4.40
				o what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	9	16	4.64	279/1512	4.28	4.50	4.10	3.86	4.64
7. Was the	grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	1	0	0	1	0	8	16	4.56	437/1623	4.62	4.48	4.16	4.08	4.56
		was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	18	7	4.28	1377/1646	4.30	4.53	4.69	4.67	4.28
How wou	ld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	12	7	4.18	766/1621	3.97	4.39	4.06	3.96	4.18
		Lecture	e															
L. Were th	e instru	actor's lectures		prepared	5	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	316/1568	4.59	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.86
		tor seem inter			5	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	591/1572	4.80	4.83	4.70	4.64	4.90
				xplained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81		4.60	4.74	4.28	4.20	4.83
		es contribute to			5	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	376/1559	4.51	4.70	4.29	4.20	4.76
				our understanding	6	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	303/1352		4.31	3.98	3.86	4.50
		-	_															
		Discus																
				what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	247/1384		4.63	4.08	3.86	4.75
				d to participate	14	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	616/1382	4.54	4.68	4.29	4.03	4.50
				d open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	2		4.83	337/1368	4.83	4.80	4.30	4.01	4.83
1. Were sp	ecial te	echniques succes	ssful		14	6	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/ 948	4.05	4.34	3.95	3.75	****
		Labora	torv															
. Were re	quiremen		-	early specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.94	4.29	4.14	5.00
	-			• •														
5 Did con	ferences	Field Williams		ield activities	24	0	0	0	0	2	0	4 00	****/ 312	****	4 25	3 68	3.51	***1
o. Dia con	I CI CIICCE	ncip you carr	y out i	icia accivities	21	O	O	O	O		Ü	1.00	/ 312		1.25	3.00	3.31	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	1									
Credits Ea	rned	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	 0	A 17		Red	uire	ed fo	or M	 aior	s 1	2	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 5			(_			-	-) -		_
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				6	Under-g	rad 2	26	Non-	-major	25
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D 0									3				3	_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				2	#### - :	Means t	here a	are not	enous	rh
	a. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0											_	respons				_	,
				P ()														
				P 0		Oth	ner					2	respons	es to r	e sign	iiiicai		

Course-Section: AMST 100 0201 Title

University of Maryland IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: KING, PAULA

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 60 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fr	equei	ncies	;		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1 Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	1	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	830/1649	4.25	4.50	4.28	4.11	4.36
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	401/1648	4.43	4.53	4.23	4.16	4.64
		estions reflec			1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	334/1375	4.51	4.50	4.27	4.10	4.73
		uations reflect			1	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27			4.56	4.20	4.03	4.27
				what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	288/1533	4.34	4.48	4.04	3.87	4.60
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	595/1512	4.28	4.50	4.10	3.86	4.33
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	2	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	130/1623	4.62	4.48	4.16	4.08	4.89
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	1004/1646	4.30	4.53	4.69	4.67	4.70
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	812/1621	3.97	4.39	4.06	3.96	4.14
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture		orepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	636/1568	4.59	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.67
		ctor seem inter			3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89		4.80	4.83	4.70	4.64	4.89
				xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	6		473/1564		4.74		4.20	4.67
		es contribute t			3	0	0	0	1	1			512/1559		4.70		4.20	4.67
				our understanding	5	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00					3.86	
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al:	acc dica			what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1384	4.47	4 63	4.08	3.86	4.80
				d to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	5		1/1382		4.68	4.08	4.03	5.00
				d open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1362	4.83	4.80		4.03	
		echniques succe		d Open discussion	7	1	0	0	1	0		4.50					3.75	
i. Were bi	peciai ec	confiduct bacce	BBLUI		,	_	O	O	_	U	3	1.50	203/ 510	1.05	1.51	3.75	3.73	1.50
		Labora																
5. Were re	equiremer	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.94	4.29	4.14	5.00
		Field	Work															
5. Did con	nferences	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.25	3.68	3.51	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Expected Grades				Pe:	asons				Ту	ne			Majors			
								, 										
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	5	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 1	B 3 C 1		0		1				1	IIn dans	r 5.c.	2	NT	mo = ===	11
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1			Gei	nera	Т				Τ.	Under-g	ıau l	.2	NON-	-major	11
84-150	3 0	3.00-3.49	_	- ·		m 7						0	шшшш ,	Va	barra -			la.
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	1	F 0 P 0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				U	#### - 1					11
				= · · · ·		O+1	0.00					2	respons	es to D	e sign	ııııcar	1L	
				5 0 I 0		Uti	her					2						
				<i>?</i> U														

Course-Section: AMST 100 0301

Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT

Instructor: CRASE, KIRSTEN

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 61 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	7	15	11	3.97	1209/1649	4.25	4.50	4.28	4.11	3.97
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	16	11	4.00	1124/1648	4.43	4.53	4.23	4.16	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	7	19	4.20	855/1375	4.51	4.50	4.27	4.10	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	10	16	4.11	996/1595	4.28	4.56	4.20	4.03	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	4	12	15	4.03	801/1533	4.34	4.48	4.04	3.87	4.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	10	10	12	3.86	1055/1512	4.28	4.50	4.10	3.86	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	8	22		635/1623		4.48	4.16	4.08	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	5	28	2		1598/1646		4.53	4.69	4.67	3.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	2	1	10	10	6	3.59	1310/1621	3.97	4.39	4.06	3.96	3.59
Tashiina														
Lecture	0	0	1	1	1	11	1.0	1 26	1101/1560	4 50	4 70	1 12	4 20	1 26
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1 1	1	4	11			1121/1568		4.70	4.43	4.39	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	_	0	2	6	26		1146/1572		4.83	4.70	4.64	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1 1	1	1 2		3	13	17 15	4.32	865/1564	4.60	4.74	4.28	4.20	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	3 1	7	13 11	15 9		1079/1559	4.51	4.70	4.29	4.20	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	Τ.	4	2	Т	/	TT	9	3.80	879/1352	4.10	4.31	3.98	3.86	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	3	5	8	13	3.87	901/1384	4.47	4.63	4.08	3.86	3.87
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	2	3	7	17	4.13	911/1382		4.68	4.29	4.03	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	2	3	25	4.65	541/1368	4.83	4.80	4.30	4.01	4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	2	2	8	12	6	3.60	678/ 948	4.05	4.34	3.95		3.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.94	4.29	4.14	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.75	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 288		4.58	3.68	3.54	****
3. Note official for grading made officer	33	Ü	J	Ü	Ü	O	_	3.00	, 200		1.50	3.00	3.31	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	***	****	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	***	****	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	***	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	4.25	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	***	****	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	***

Course-Section: AMST 100 0301

Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT

Instructor:

CRASE, KIRSTEN

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 35

41

CULT Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 61 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E					d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	2	 А	24	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	7	Under-grad	35	Non-major	35
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 100Y 0101

Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT

Instructor: KING, PAULA

Enrollment: 17

Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 62 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eauei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	550/1649	4.57	4.50	4.28	4.11	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	672/1648	4.43	4.53	4.23	4.16	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	780/1375	4.29	4.50	4.27	4.10	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	417/1595	4.57	4.56	4.20	4.03	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	495/1533	4.38	4.48	4.04	3.87	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	543/1512	4.38	4.50	4.10	3.86	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	382/1623	4.62	4.48	4.16	4.08	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	897/1646	4.77	4.53	4.69	4.67	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	442/1621	4.45	4.39	4.06	3.96	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	424/1568	4.79	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	473/1572	4.93	4.83	4.70	4.64	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	216/1564	4.86	4.74	4.28	4.20	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	448/1559	4.71	4.70	4.29	4.20	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	303/1352	4.50	4.31	3.98	3.86	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	302/1384	4.69	4.63	4.08	3.86	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1 1	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	593/1382	4.54	4.68	4.08	4.03	4.54
	1	0	0	1	0	1		4.54	493/1368	4.54		4.29		
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	1	1	4	5	4.69	370/ 948		4.80		4.01 3.75	
4. Were special techniques successium	1	۷	U	1	1	4	5	4.10	3/0/ 940	4.10	4.34	3.95	3.75	4.10
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.94	4.29	4.14	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 81	****	4.75	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 288	***	4.58	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 312	****	4.25	3.68	3.51	****
1 tomotomoss note 100 carry out richa accryticies		J	J	3	3	_	_	1.50	, 512		1.25	3.00	3.31	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****

Course-Section: AMST 100Y 0101

Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT

Instructor: KING, PAULA

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 62 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5 5	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 200 0101

Title MULTICULTURAL AMERICA

Instructor:

Baltimore County MOFFITT, KIMBER Fall 2008

Page 63 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 28

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Ouestion	_															
						NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		this course	0	0	1	1	1	8	17	4.39	789/1649	4.39	4.50	4.28	4.29	4.39
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	0	4	7	16	4.32	,	4.32	4.53	4.23	4.25	4.32
		uestions reflec			0	0	2	0	4	5		4.25		4.25	4.50	4.27	4.37	
	_	uations reflect	_	_	0	1	1	1	2	6	17	4.37		4.37	4.56	4.20	4.22	4.37
		eadings contrib			0	0	2	1	1	6	18	4.32		4.32	4.48	4.04	4.04	4.32
				what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	6	18	4.39	532/1512	4.39	4.50	4.10	4.14	4.39
		g system clearl		4	0	0	0	1	7	6			904/1623	4.18	4.48	4.16	4.21	
	_	was class canc		ica	0	0	0	0	3	22	3		1544/1646		4.53	4.69	4.63	
	-			ng effectiveness	5	1	1	1	2				766/1621			4.06		
J. 11011 110	ouzu you	grade one evera		9 01100017011000		_	_	-	_	•		1110	,00,1021	1.10	1.00	1.00	1.01	1110
		Lectur	_															
		uctor's lecture			2	0	1	0	0	7	18	4.58	767/1568		4.70	4.43	4.39	4.58
2. Did th	he instru	ctor seem inter	ested in	the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	473/1572	4.92	4.83	4.70	4.73	4.92
3. Was 1ϵ	ecture ma	terial presente	d and exp	lained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	6	18	4.54	620/1564		4.74	4.28	4.27	4.54
4. Did th	he lectur	es contribute t	o what yo	ou learned	2	0	1	0	0	8	17	4.54	662/1559	4.54	4.70	4.29	4.33	4.54
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance you	ır understanding	4	1	0	3	5	5	10	3.96	754/1352	3.96	4.31	3.98	4.07	3.96
		Discus			14													
	d class discussions contribute to what you lear ere all students actively encouraged to particip					0	0	1	1	1	11				4.63		3.99	4.57
					14	0	0	0	1	2	11				4.68	4.29	4.19	
				open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	2		4.86		4.86		4.30		4.86
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful		14	2	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	176/ 948	4.58	4.34	3.95	3.89	4.58
		Labora	tory															
5 Were a	requireme	nts for lab rep	_	rly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/ 555	5 00	4 94	4 29	4 33	5 00
J. WCIC I	requireme	nes for lab rep	OICS CICC	arry specifica	,	U	O	O	O	O	21	3.00	1/ 333	3.00	1.71	1.27	1.55	3.00
		Semina	r															
5. Were	criteria	for grading mad	e clear		26	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.58	3.68	3.65	****
5 D'1	-	Field			0.6	•	0	•	0	•	0	4 00	**** / 210	ale ale ale ale	4 05	2 60	2 50	als als als als
5. Did co	onference	s help you carr	y out fie	eld activities	26	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.25	3.68	3.59	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	\$			Tyj	pe			Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Red	mir	ed fo	or Ma	ijor	s 1	3	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В 9			-1		10	- ,		-	or adda c	-	-		_	ŭ
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 4		Ger	nera:	1				2	Under-g	rad 2	18	Non-	major	28
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0		001	a.	_				_	011001 9.	2	-	2.011		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				2	#### - I	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
	Ü	P 0								_	respons				_			
		I O		0+1	her					6	I CDP OHD.		91					
				? 1		001						-						

Course-Section: AMST 290 0101

Title APPROACH IN AMER STUDI

Instructor: BRYAN, KATHY

Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 15

AMER STUDI Baltimore County
Y Fall 2008

Page 64 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			General	 1															
1.	Did voi	ı gain n	ew insights, skil		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	433/1649	4.67	4.50	4.28	4.29	4.67
			ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	614/1648	4.47	4.53	4.23	4.25	4.47
			uestions reflect			0	7	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	694/1375	4.38	4.50	4.27	4.37	4.38
4.	Did oth	ner eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.56	4.20	4.22	4.67
5.	Did ass	signed r	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	342/1533	4.53	4.48	4.04	4.04	4.53
6.	Did wri	itten as	signments contri	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	263/1512	4.67	4.50	4.10	4.14	4.67
			g system clearly		ined	0	0	0	0	0	2			140/1623	4.87	4.48	4.16	4.21	4.87
			was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	9			1287/1646	4.40	4.53	4.69	4.63	
9.	How wor	ıld you	grade the overal	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	442/1621	4.45	4.39	4.06	4.01	4.45
			Lecture	<u> </u>															
1.	Were th	ne instr	uctor's lectures		prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	316/1568	4.86	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.86
			ctor seem intere			1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	876/1572	4.79	4.83	4.70		4.79
3.	Was led	cture ma	terial presented	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	498/1564	4.64	4.74	4.28	4.27	4.64
4.	Did the	e lectur	es contribute to	what	you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	448/1559	4.71	4.70	4.29	4.33	4.71
5.	Did aud	diovisua	l techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	2	1	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	805/1352	3.92	4.31	3.98	4.07	3.92
			Discuss																
					what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	-	4.56	406/1384	4.56	4.63	4.08	3.99	4.56
					d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1		4.89	262/1382	4.89	4.68	4.29	4.19	4.89
			_		d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1		4.89	285/1368	4.89	4.80	4.30	4.21	
4.	Were sp	pecial t	echniques succes	ssful		6	1	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	293/ 948	4.38	4.34	3.95	3.89	4.38
			Laborat	cory															
5.	Were re	equireme	nts for lab repo	-	early specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.94	4.29	4.33	5.00
-	n		Field V			1 1	^	^	0	0	0	1	F 00	****/ 210		4 05	2 60	2 50	****
5.	Dia cor	nierence	s help you carry	y out i	ield activities	14	0	0	U	U	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	***	4.25	3.68	3.59	^ ^ ^ ^
			Self I	Paced															
5.	Were th	nere eno	ugh proctors for	r all t	he students	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.72	***
					Frequ	enas	Diet	-rib	ıtior	,									
					riequ	енсу	DIS	-1100	20101	1									
Cre	dits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Tyj	pe			Majors				
0.0	-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А б		Rec	mire	 ed fo	or Ma	ior		0	Graduat		0	Majo	 r	10
	-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 5		1101	1411	Ju		. , 0 =	~	Ü	or adda o	_	•	11000	-	
	-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	5
	-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D 0									5-				3	
Gr	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 1						Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
	P 0													response	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
	I 0						Oth	ner				1	2						
	? 0																		

Course-Section: AMST 303 0101

Title ETHNOGRAPHY IN AMERICA

Instructor: HUMMEL, MICHAEL

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 16

25

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Page 65 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	-01161	ncie	g		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	484/1649		4.50	4.28	4.27	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	263/1648	4.75	4.53	4.23	4.18	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.50	4.27	4.22	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0		15	4.94	93/1595		4.56	4.20	4.21	4.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	319/1533		4.48	4.04	4.05	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	294/1512		4.50	4.10	4.11	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	220/1623		4.48	4.16	4.08	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	10		1037/1646		4.53	4.69	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	428/1621	4.46	4.39	4.06	4.02	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	767/1568	4.57	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	414/1572		4.83	4.70	4.64	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	0	13	4.73	374/1564		4.74	4.28	4.25	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	13	4.73	419/1559		4.70	4.29	4.23	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	2	0	1	8	4.36	432/1352		4.31	3.98	3.97	
J. Did dudiovibual econniques emianee your understanding	_	-	O		O	_	O	1.50	132/1332	1.50	1.51	3.70	3.57	1.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	302/1384	4.69	4.63	4.08	4.11	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	302/1382	4.85	4.68	4.29	4.37	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	211/1368	4.92	4.80	4.30	4.39	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	161/ 948	4.64	4.34	3.95	4.00	4.64
T albaniak aimi														
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	1 01	4 20	4.22	E 00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	U	U	U	U	U	13	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.94	4.29	4.22	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.75	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	4.58	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work	1 -	0	0	0	^	0	1	г оо	**** / FO	****		1 00	2 50	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 48			4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****		4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	***	4.25	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****

Course-Section: AMST 303 0101

Title ETHNOGRAPHY IN AMERICA

Instructor:

HUMMEL, MICHAEL

Enrollment: 25

Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 65 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned				Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	С	1	General	5	Under-grad	16	Non-major	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-		_	
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 320 0101 Title

TV IN AMERICAN CULTURE

Instructor: HUMMEL, MICHAEL

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 31 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 66 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Questions						Fr 1	equei 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 I															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil	_	m this course	0	0	1	0	4	8	18	4.35	844/1649	4.35	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.35
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	1	12	17	4.45	629/1648	4.45	4.53	4.23	4.18	4.45
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	7	24	4.77	271/1375	4.77	4.50	4.27	4.22	4.77
4. Did of	ther evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	20	4.58	405/1595	4.58	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.58
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contribu	ıte to	what you learned	0	0	1	1	8	9	12	3.97	855/1533	3.97	4.48	4.04	4.05	3.97
				o what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	11	19	4.52	373/1512	4.52	4.50	4.10	4.11	4.52
	-	g system clearly	_	ined	1	1	0	0	0	8	21	4.72	251/1623	4.72	4.48	4.16	4.08	4.72
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	8	23	4.74	929/1646		4.53	4.69	4.67	4.74
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overal	ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	0	1	1	1	15	8	4.08	875/1621	4.08	4.39	4.06	4.02	4.08
		Lecture	9															
		actor's lectures			3	0	0	0	1	10	17	4.57	767/1568	4.57	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.57
		ctor seem intere		_	3	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	790/1572	4.82	4.83	4.70	4.64	4.82
		-		xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	244/1564	4.82	4.74	4.28	4.25	4.82
		es contribute to		•	3	0	0	0	1	7	20	4.68	499/1559	4.68	4.70	4.29	4.23	4.68
5. Did a	udiovisual	l techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	3	0	1	0	1	1	25	4.75	157/1352	4.75	4.31	3.98	3.97	4.75
		Discus																
				what you learned	14	0	1	1	1	4	10	4.24	685/1384	4.24	4.63	4.08	4.11	4.24
				d to participate	14	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	706/1382	4.41	4.68	4.29	4.37	4.41
				d open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	484/1368	4.71	4.80	4.30	4.39	4.71
4. Were	special te	echniques succes	ssful		14	2	1	1	3	1	9	4.07	417/ 948	4.07	4.34	3.95	4.00	4.07
		Laborat	cory															
5. Were	requiremer	nts for lab repo	orts cl	early specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.94	4.29	4.22	5.00
		Semina	="															
5. Were	criteria f	for grading made	e clear		30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.58	3.68	3.58	****
		Field V	Vork															
5. Did co	onferences	s help you carry	out f	ield activities	28	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 312	****	4.25	3.68	3.60	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits I	Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	\$		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 16		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 1	.3	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 12		~		,			-	0	TT	2 2	. 1	37		2.0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3 7	C 2 D 0		Ge	nera	Т			1	.2	Under-g	rad :	31	Non-	-major	30
84-150 Grad.	16 0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	8	D 0 F 0		רים	ecti	7707				1	#### - 1	Meana +	here -	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	O	Р 0		ĽТ	CCLI	v CS				Τ.	respons				_	111
				I O		O+	her					4	T Capolla	LD LU L	c argi	ııııcaı	10	
				? 0		JL						-						
				. 0														

Course-Section: AMST 344 0101 University of Maryland Title MATERIAL CULTURE IN US

Instructor:

KING, PAULA

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 67

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 32 Questionnaires: 22 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0 0 0	0 0 1	0 0 0	2 0 1	1 2 0	5 4 3	14 16 17	4.41 4.64 4.71	776/1649 401/1648 347/1375	4.41 4.64 4.71	4.50 4.53 4.50	4.28 4.23 4.27	4.27 4.18 4.22	4.41 4.64 4.71
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	0 0 1	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 1 0	1 1 3 2	5	17 15 13	4.73 4.55 4.48	263/1595 334/1533 422/1512	4.73 4.55 4.48	4.56 4.48 4.50	4.20 4.04 4.10	4.21 4.05 4.11	4.73 4.55 4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0 1 5	0 0 0	0	0	0 2	4	17	4.81	405/1623 833/1646 356/1621	4.59 4.81 4.53		4.16 4.69 4.06	4.08 4.67 4.02	
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2 2 2 3 3	0 0 0 0 5	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	1 0 0 1 2	3 0 3 1 3	16 20 17 17	4.75 5.00 4.85 4.84 4.50	480/1568 1/1572 216/1564 272/1559 303/1352	4.75 5.00 4.85 4.84 4.50	4.70 4.83 4.74 4.70 4.31	4.43 4.70 4.28 4.29 3.98	4.39 4.64 4.25 4.23 3.97	4.75 5.00 4.85 4.84 4.50
Discussion 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 4. Were special techniques successful	5 5 5 5	0 0 0 3	0 0 0	1 0 0	1 1 1		12 14 15 9	4.53 4.76 4.82 4.43	424/1384 383/1382 348/1368 265/ 948	4.53 4.76 4.82 4.43	4.63 4.68 4.80 4.34	4.08 4.29 4.30 3.95	4.11 4.37 4.39 4.00	4.53 4.76 4.82 4.43
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.94	4.29	4.22	5.00
Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	***	4.58	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.25	3.68	3.60	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 6 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 9 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 2 C 4 84-150 4 3.00-3.49 6 D 0			quire		or Ma	ijor		3 5	Graduate Under-gr		0	Majo Non-	r major	3
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 1		Ele Otl	ectiv ner	res				1 9	#### - 1 response				_	h

Course-Section: AMST 352 0101

Title AMER CULTURE:GLOBAL PE

Instructor: CAMPBELL, DUNCA

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 68 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

			Fr	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank				Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	13	4.55	590/1649	4.55	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	3		4.41			4.53	4.23	4.18	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	5	11	4.37			4.50	4.27	4.22	4.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	15	4.55	451/1595	4.55	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	198/1533	4.73	4.48	4.04	4.05	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	5	14	4.41	522/1512	4.41	4.50	4.10	4.11	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	3	15	4.32	744/1623	4.32	4.48	4.16	4.08	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	13	8	4.27	1384/1646	4.27	4.53	4.69	4.67	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	469/1621	4.44	4.39	4.06	4.02	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	1	19	4.81	387/1568	4.81	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	715/1572		4.83	4.70	4.64	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	342/1564		4.74	4.28	4.25	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	318/1559	4.81	4.70	4.29	4.23	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	2	1	1	12	4.44	370/1352	4.44	4.31	3.98	3.97	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	165/1384	4.88	4.63	4.08	4.11	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	332/1382	4.81	4.68	4.29	4.37	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	185/1368	4.94	4.80	4.30	4.39	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	6	10	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	310/ 948	4.33	4.34	3.95	4.00	4.33
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.94	4.29	4.22	5.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	***	4.25	3.68	3.60	****
Frequ	.ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	 ajor	 ŝ	2	 Graduat	 e	 1	Majo	 r	 5

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	3	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	21	Non-major	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-	•	_	
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: AMST 357 0101

Title SP TOPICS:COMM, MEDIA, A

Instructor: MOFFITT, KIMBER

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 32

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 69 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fre	equer	ncies	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 1															
1. Did you	gain ne	w insights,skil		this course	0	0	0	2	1	6	23	4.56	563/1649	4.56	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.56
_	_	tor make clear			0	0	0	1	0	12	19	4.53		4.53	4.53	4.23	4.18	4.53
		estions reflect			0	0	0	1	0	5	26	4.75	296/1375	4.75	4.50	4.27	4.22	4.75
		ations reflect			0	0	1	0	1	11	19	4.47	552/1595	4.47	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.47
				hat you learned	1	0	0	1	2	9	19	4.48	388/1533	4.48	4.48	4.04	4.05	4.48
				what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	8	19	4.41		4.41	4.50	4.10	4.11	4.41
		system clearly			0	0	0	1	0	11	20		437/1623	4.56	4.48	4.16	4.08	4.56
		was class cance			0	0	0	1	1	22	8		1469/1646	4.16	4.53	4.69	4.67	4.16
				ing effectiveness	11	0	0	0	0	8	13		279/1621				4.02	
		Lecture	9															
1 Were th	ne inetru	ctor's lectures.	_	renared	2	0	1	0	1	7	21	4.57	779/1568	4.57	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.57
		tor seem intere	_	_	2	0	1	1	1	3	24		1146/1572	4.60	4.70	4.43	4.64	4.60
				plained clearly	3	0	1	0	1	6		4.59	570/1564	4.59	4.74	4.70	4.25	4.59
		-	-		2	0	1	0	1	7						4.29		
		s contribute to						0			21			4.57	4.70		4.23	
5. Did aud	iiovisuai	techniques enr	nance you	ur understanding	2	0	1	0	0	4	25	4.73	167/1352	4.73	4.31	3.98	3.97	4.73
		Discuss	sion															
				hat you learned	6	0	1	0	1	8	16	4.46	478/1384	4.46	4.63	4.08	4.11	4.46
2. Were al	.1 studen	ts actively end	couraged	to participate	6	0	1	0	2	4	19	4.54	593/1382	4.54	4.68	4.29	4.37	4.54
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage f	fair and	open discussion	6	0	1	0	2	5	18	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.80	4.30	4.39	4.50
4. Were sp	ecial te	chniques succes	ssful		6	4	1	2	3	6	10	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.34	3.95	4.00	4.00
		Laborat	tory															
5. Were re	equiremen	ts for lab repo	orts clea	arly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.94	4.29	4.22	5.00
		Seminar	r															
5. Were cr	riteria f	or grading made			29	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 288	****	4.58	3.68	3.58	****
		Field V	Work															
5. Did con	ferences	help you carry	y out fi	eld activities	28	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 312	***	4.25	3.68	3.60	***
				Frequ	lency	Dist	tribı	ation	a									
a 1'. =	,	a ana			_			_					_					
Credits Ea	irnea 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	S 			Ту]	pe 			Majors 	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 14		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	11
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	в 10														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 2		Ger	neral	L			1	.3	Under-g	rad 3	32	Non-	-major	21
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	D 0														
04-150	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		El€	ectiv	ves				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	_J h
Grad.	0																	
	U			P 0									respons	es to b	e sigr	vificar.	ıt	
	U			P 0 I 0		Oth	ıer				1	.1	respons	es to b	e sigr	nificar	nt	

Course-Section: AMST 380 0101 Title

COMMUNITY IN AMERICA

Instructor: ORSER, EDWARD W

Enrollment: 37 Questionnaires: 31 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 70 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	cie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	9	19	4.45	710/1649	4.45	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	23	4.61	427/1648	4.61	4.53	4.23	4.18	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	7	22	4.58	480/1375	4.58	4.50	4.27	4.22	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	10	19	4.48	524/1595	4.48	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	22	4.67	241/1533	4.67	4.48	4.04	4.05	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	5	21	4.47	436/1512	4.47	4.50	4.10	4.11	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	8	19	4.47	555/1623	4.47	4.48	4.16	4.08	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	6	22	4.72	961/1646	4.72	4.53	4.69	4.67	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	1	12	10	4.39	523/1621	4.39	4.39	4.06	4.02	4.39
. 3														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	372/1568	4.81	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	715/1572	4.86	4.83	4.70	4.64	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	216/1564	4.86	4.74	4.28	4.25	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	23	4.75	390/1559	4.75	4.70	4.29	4.23	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	6	8	15	4.31	473/1352	4.31	4.31	3.98	3.97	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	5	16	4.64	351/1384	4.64	4.63	4.08	4.11	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	464/1382	4.68	4.68	4.29	4.37	4.68
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	2	3	16	4.55	624/1368	4.55	4.80	4.30	4.39	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	1	0	5	5	7	3.94	492/ 948			3.95	4.00	3.94
									, ,					
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.94	4.29	4.22	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	4.75	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	****	4.58	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	1	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.25	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****

Course-Section: AMST 380 0101

Title COMMUNITY IN AMERICA

Instructor: ORSER, EDWARD W

Enrollment: 37
Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 70 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	В	16						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	4	Under-grad	31	Non-major	22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 391 0101

Title STUDIES IN AMERICAN CU

Instructor: CAMPBELL, DUNCA

Enrollment: 49
Questionnaires: 27

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 71 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	0 0	s from this course	1	0	0	1	5	9	11	4.15	1067/1649	4.15	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.15
2. Did the	e instruc	tor make clear t	the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	11	10	4.12	1054/1648	4.12	4.53	4.23	4.18	4.12
	_		the expected goals	1	3	0	2	4	7	10		922/1375	4.09	4.50	4.27		
			the expected goals	1	2	1	2	2	6	13	4.17		4.17	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.17
	_	-	e to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	10		4.27		4.27	4.48	4.04		4.27
			oute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	2	8	12	4.12		4.12	4.50	4.10	4.11	
		system clearly		1	0	1	1	3	5			757/1623	4.31	4.48	4.16		4.31
		was class cancel		1	1	0	0	0	13			1211/1646	4.48	4.53	4.69		4.48
9. How wor	ula you g	rade the overall	teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	1	15	4	3.95	987/1621	3.95	4.39	4.06	4.02	3.95
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures	well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	6	16	4.48	878/1568	4.48	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.48
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem interes	sted in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	7	16	4.56	1184/1572	4.56	4.83	4.70	4.64	4.56
			and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	5		4.56	590/1564	4.56	4.74	4.28	4.25	4.56
			what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	5			832/1559		4.70			4.40
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enha	nce your understanding	4	4	2	1	6	3	7	3.63	986/1352	3.63	4.31	3.98	3.97	3.63
		Discussi	on														
1. Did cla	ass discu		te to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	326/1384	4.67	4.63	4.08	4.11	4.67
			ouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	600/1382	4.53	4.68	4.29	4.37	4.53
			ir and open discussion	9	0	0	0	3	1	14	4.61	569/1368	4.61	4.80	4.30	4.39	4.61
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques success	ful	9	12	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/ 948	***	4.34	3.95	4.00	****
		Laborato	orv														
5. Were r	equiremen		ts clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.94	4.29	4.22	5.00
		Seminar															
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading made	clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 288	****	4.58	3.68	3.58	****
		5										,					
	_	Field Wo															
5. Did co	nferences	help you carry	out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	50/ 312	4.25	4.25	3.68	3.60	4.25
		Self Pa	iced														
5. Were t	here enou	gh proctors for	all the students	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	***	****	3.99	4.05	***
			Fred	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
			1104	u01107	210	0112		-									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Тур	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0 A 4		Re	 guir	ed fo	or M	 ajor	`s	0	Graduate		0	Majo	 or	17
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0 B 13		_				J						3 -		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2 C 2		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-gr	rad 2	27	Non-	-major	10
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5 D 0													-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4 F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - N				_	jh
			P 0									response	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
			I 0		Ot!	her				1	.9						
			? 0														

Course-Section: AMST 406 0201 University of Maryland Title INTERNSHIP W/SEMINAR

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 72

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Instructor: KING, PAULA Enrollment: 4

F

Ρ

I

0

1

0

Questionnaires: 4

0

3.50-4.00

Grad.

									ncies	3			ructor	Course				
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Di	d vou gai	n new insights,ski.		this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.50	4.28	4.50	5.00
		structor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.53	4.23	4.36	5.00
		evaluations reflect			1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.56	4.20	4.36	5.00
		assignments contr			1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.26	5.00
		ding system clearl			1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.48	4.16	4.27	5.00
		mes was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.53	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. Но	w would y	ou grade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.39	4.06	4.24	5.00
		Lectur	e															
1. We	re the in	structor's lecture	s well p	repared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.54	5.00
2. Di	d the ins	structor seem inter	ested in	the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.83	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Wa	s lecture	material presente	d and ex	plained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.74	4.28	4.40	5.00
4. Di	d the lec	tures contribute t	o what y	ou learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.70	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Di	d audiovi	sual techniques en	hance yo	ur understanding	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.31	3.98	4.07	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Di	d class d	liscussions contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.63	4.08	4.35	5.00
		udents actively en			1	-	0	0	0	0	3		1/1382	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.56	5.00
		structor encourage		open discussion	1	-	0	0	0	0	3		1/1368		4.80	4.30	4.58	5.00
4. We	re specia	l techniques succe	ssful		1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.34	3.95	4.31	5.00
		Labora	-															
5. We	re requir	rements for lab rep	orts cle	arly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.94	4.29	4.41	5.00
		Field	Work															
5. Di	d confere	ences help you carr	y out fi	eld activities	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.25	3.68	3.95	4.00
				Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Crodi	ts Earned	l Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				P.O.	asons	,			Туј	20			Majors	
		Cuill. GPA							asons) 				pe 			Ma JOIS	
00-2		0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajors	5	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	2
28-5		1.00-1.99	0	в 0				_				_						
56-8		2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	T				0	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	2
84-1	.50 1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														

Electives

Other

1

2

Course-Section: AMST 490 0101 University of Maryland SENIOR SEMINAR

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

16

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 73

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Title Instructor: ORSER, EDWARD W

		Questions	3		NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncie	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General	=															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights,skil	ls from	this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	536/1649	4.58	4.50	4.28	4.50	4.58
2. Did th	e instruc	tor make clear	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	263/1648	4.75	4.53	4.23	4.36	4.75
3. Did th	e exam qu	estions reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	6	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	733/1375	4.33	4.50	4.27	4.48	4.33
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	405/1595	4.58	4.56	4.20	4.36	4.58
5. Did as	signed re	adings contribu	ite to v	hat you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	241/1533	4.67	4.48	4.04	4.14	4.67
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contri	bute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	194/1512	4.75	4.50	4.10	4.26	4.75
		system clearly		ned	0	0	0	1	1	7	3	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.48	4.16	4.27	4.00
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.53	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overal	.l teach	ning effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	191/1621	4.71	4.39	4.06	4.24	4.71
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures	well p	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	245/1568	4.90	4.70	4.43	4.54	4.90
2. Did th	e instruc	tor seem intere	ested in	the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	591/1572	4.90	4.83	4.70	4.79	4.90
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presented	and ex	plained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	169/1564	4.90	4.74	4.28	4.40	4.90
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute to	what y	ou learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	205/1559	4.90	4.70	4.29	4.41	4.90
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enh	nance yo	our understanding	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	247/1352	4.60	4.31	3.98	4.07	4.60
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu			hat you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	201/1384	4.80	4.63	4.08	4.35	4.80
				l to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90			4.68	4.29	4.56	4.90
				l open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	264/1368	4.90	4.80	4.30	4.58	4.90
		chniques succes			2	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	115/ 948		4.34	3.95	4.31	4.78
		Laborat	orv															
5. Were r	equiremen	its for lab repo	-	early specified	8	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	388/ 555	4.00	4.94	4.29	4.41	4.00
		Seminar	-															
1. Were a	ssigned t			announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.66	****
				vidual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.54	****
				hat you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.75	4.43	4.57	****
	_	ns contribute t		-	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	4.44	****
		or grading made		you rourned	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	31/ 288		4.58	3.68	3.71	4.67
		Field W	Iork															
5. Did co	nferences	help you carry		eld activities	4	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	50/ 312	4.25	4.25	3.68	3.95	4.25
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
				_	-								_					
Credits E	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	5 			Ту	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Re	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 7		~		1				0	TT7		2	37		0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 2		Ge	nera:	Т				0	Under-g	rad I	.2	Non-	-major	2
84-150	6 0	3.00-3.49	3 1	D 0 F 0		m 7	ectiv					0	инии -	Maana +	h			.lo
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	Τ	F 0		EI	ecti	ves				U	#### -				_	111
				I 0		O+1	her				1	0	respons	es lo D	e sign	ıııcan	IL	
				5 0		UL.	1161				1	U						
				. 0														

Course-Section: AMST 495 0301

Title HONORS SEMINAR IN AMST

Instructor: ORSER, EDWARD W

Enrollment: 4
Questionnaires: 4

Fall 2008

Page 74 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

		Question	5		NR	NA	Fro	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u qain new	v insights,ski		m this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.50	4.28	4.50	5.00
_	_	or make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	263/1648	4.75	4.53	4.23	4.36	4.75
		estions reflec			1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.50	4.27	4.48	5.00
	_	ations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.56	4.20	4.36	5.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.48	4.04	4.14	5.00
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.26	5.00
		system clearl			0	0	0	1	1	1	1		1387/1623	3.50	4.48	4.16	4.27	3.50
		vas class canc			0	0	0	0	0	2	2		1193/1646	4.50	4.53	4.69	4.71	
				hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.39	4.06	4.24	5.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instruc	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	636/1568	4.67	4.70	4.43	4.54	4.67
		or seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	1	2		1071/1572	4.67	4.83	4.70	4.79	4.67
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.74	4.28	4.40	5.00
		s contribute t			1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.70	4.29	4.41	5.00
				our understanding	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.31	3.98	4.07	4.00
		Discus	gion															
1 Did cl:	ace diecus			what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.63	4.08	4.35	5.00
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	483/1382	4.67	4.68	4.29	4.56	4.67
		-	_	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.80	4.30	4.58	5.00
5. Were re	equirement	Labora s for lab rep	_	early specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.94	4.29	4.41	5.00
		Semina	r															
1. Were as	ssigned to	pics relevant	to the	announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.66	5.00
2. Was the	e instruct	or available	for ind	ividual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.54	5.00
3. Did res	search pro	jects contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	30/ 81	4.75	4.75	4.43	4.57	4.75
	_	ns contribute		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.44	5.00
_		or grading mad		-	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	37/ 288	4.50	4.58	3.68	3.71	4.50
		Field	Work															
5. Did con	nferences	help you carr	y out f	ield activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	28/ 312	4.50	4.25	3.68	3.95	4.50
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ty	pe			Majors	
														- 				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	5	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1		~		,				1	1	,	4			0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	Τ				1	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	-major	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D 0										_				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### -				_	h
				P 0								0	respons	es to b	e sigr	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner					2						
				? 0														