

Course-Section: AMST 100 0101
 Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT
 Instructor: BRYAN, KATHY
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 23
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	6	2	15	4.29	838/1504	4.31	4.37	4.27	4.13	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	7	14	4.46	572/1503	4.53	4.40	4.20	4.16	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	12	0	1	3	1	7	4.17	853/1290	4.28	4.63	4.28	4.19	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	1	4	3	14	4.22	821/1453	4.28	4.51	4.21	4.11	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	5	5	13	4.25	548/1421	4.40	4.46	4.00	3.91	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	5	14	4.25	581/1365	4.25	4.44	4.08	3.96	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	6	6	11	4.13	914/1485	4.30	4.40	4.16	4.13	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	1	1	7	14	4.48	1112/1504	4.46	4.55	4.69	4.66	4.48
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	7	9	7	4.00	850/1483	4.02	4.31	4.06	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	4	16	4.48	818/1425	4.49	4.62	4.41	4.36	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	4	17	4.61	1050/1426	4.75	4.90	4.69	4.56	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	617/1418	4.53	4.58	4.25	4.20	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	4	14	4.35	799/1416	4.42	4.55	4.26	4.21	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	1	0	4	16	4.67	177/1199	4.39	4.39	3.97	3.82	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	394/1312	4.46	4.54	4.00	3.69	4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	5	4	9	4.11	887/1303	4.44	4.71	4.24	3.93	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	2	4	12	4.42	656/1299	4.65	4.77	4.25	3.94	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	454/ 758	3.63	4.11	4.01	3.80	3.92
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	26	Non-major	18
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	1	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 100 0201
 Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT
 Instructor: KING, PAULA
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 24
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	3	8	15	4.33	788/1504	4.31	4.37	4.27	4.13	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	6	19	4.59	391/1503	4.53	4.40	4.20	4.16	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	2	1	7	15	4.40	642/1290	4.28	4.63	4.28	4.19	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	8	15	4.33	680/1453	4.28	4.51	4.21	4.11	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	6	18	4.56	283/1421	4.40	4.46	4.00	3.91	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	0	10	14	4.26	581/1365	4.25	4.44	4.08	3.96	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	3	20	4.48	482/1485	4.30	4.40	4.16	4.13	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	15	12	4.44	1138/1504	4.46	4.55	4.69	4.66	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	0	2	12	6	4.05	827/1483	4.02	4.31	4.06	3.97	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	6	17	4.50	784/1425	4.49	4.62	4.41	4.36	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	549/1426	4.75	4.90	4.69	4.56	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	7	17	4.58	488/1418	4.53	4.58	4.25	4.20	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	5	18	4.50	623/1416	4.42	4.55	4.26	4.21	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	0	1	3	7	7	4.11	593/1199	4.39	4.39	3.97	3.82	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	424/1312	4.46	4.54	4.00	3.69	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	333/1303	4.44	4.71	4.24	3.93	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	223/1299	4.65	4.77	4.25	3.94	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	10	6	2	2	2	2	4	3.33	630/ 758	3.63	4.11	4.01	3.80	3.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	28	Non-major	26
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Course-Section: AMST 200 0201
 Title MULTICULTURAL AMERICA
 Instructor: WALLACE, KENDRA
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 25
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	416/1504	4.60	4.37	4.27	4.26	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	472/1503	4.52	4.40	4.20	4.18	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	11	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.63	4.28	4.27	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	363/1453	4.57	4.51	4.21	4.20	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	16	4.60	247/1421	4.60	4.46	4.00	3.90	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	5	13	4.45	370/1365	4.45	4.44	4.08	4.00	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.40	4.16	4.15	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	1	13	5	4.05	1397/1504	4.05	4.55	4.69	4.68	4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	211/1483	4.67	4.31	4.06	4.02	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	331/1425	4.81	4.62	4.41	4.40	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	301/1426	4.95	4.90	4.69	4.71	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	342/1418	4.70	4.58	4.25	4.22	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	574/1416	4.55	4.55	4.26	4.24	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	403/1199	4.37	4.39	3.97	3.95	4.37
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	0	11	4.54	343/1312	4.54	4.54	4.00	3.98	4.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	344/1303	4.77	4.71	4.24	4.23	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	344/1299	4.77	4.77	4.25	4.21	4.77
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	175/ 758	4.54	4.11	4.01	3.89	4.54
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.30	****
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	21	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	11	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						

I 0
? 0

Other

8

Course-Section: AMST 222 0101
 Title INTRO MEDIA STUDIES
 Instructor: LOVIGLIO, JASON
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 26
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	416/1504	4.68	4.37	4.27	4.26	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	4	10	4.20	910/1503	4.37	4.40	4.20	4.18	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	507/1290	4.75	4.63	4.28	4.27	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	5	10	4.32	705/1453	4.45	4.51	4.21	4.20	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	127/1421	4.78	4.46	4.00	3.90	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	420/1365	4.47	4.44	4.08	4.00	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	8	8	4.10	938/1485	4.13	4.40	4.16	4.15	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	657/1504	4.68	4.55	4.69	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	161/1483	4.62	4.31	4.06	4.02	4.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	1022/1425	4.43	4.62	4.41	4.40	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.90	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	514/1418	4.65	4.58	4.25	4.22	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	574/1416	4.74	4.55	4.26	4.24	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	2	2	2	4	3.55	905/1199	3.71	4.39	3.97	3.95	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	158/1312	4.86	4.54	4.00	3.98	4.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	288/1303	4.86	4.71	4.24	4.23	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1299	4.92	4.77	4.25	4.21	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	471/ 758	3.95	4.11	4.01	3.89	3.90

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	20	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 222 0201
 Title INTRO MEDIA STUDIES
 Instructor: LOVIGLIO, JASON
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 27
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	250/1504	4.68	4.37	4.27	4.26	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	460/1503	4.37	4.40	4.20	4.18	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1290	4.75	4.63	4.28	4.27	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	352/1453	4.45	4.51	4.21	4.20	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	151/1421	4.78	4.46	4.00	3.90	4.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	274/1365	4.47	4.44	4.08	4.00	4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	878/1485	4.13	4.40	4.16	4.15	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1121/1504	4.68	4.55	4.69	4.68	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	338/1483	4.62	4.31	4.06	4.02	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	688/1425	4.43	4.62	4.41	4.40	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.90	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	261/1418	4.65	4.58	4.25	4.22	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	127/1416	4.74	4.55	4.26	4.24	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	762/1199	3.71	4.39	3.97	3.95	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	100/1312	4.86	4.54	4.00	3.98	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	177/1303	4.86	4.71	4.24	4.23	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	273/1299	4.92	4.77	4.25	4.21	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	387/ 758	3.95	4.11	4.01	3.89	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 290 0101
 Title APPROACH IN AMER STUDI
 Instructor: BRYAN, KATHY
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 28
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	1010/1504	4.14	4.37	4.27	4.26	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	891/1503	4.21	4.40	4.20	4.18	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.63	4.28	4.27	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	407/1453	4.54	4.51	4.21	4.20	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	698/1421	4.08	4.46	4.00	3.90	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	681/1365	4.15	4.44	4.08	4.00	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	423/1485	4.54	4.40	4.16	4.15	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1186/1504	4.38	4.55	4.69	4.68	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	397/1483	4.45	4.31	4.06	4.02	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	402/1425	4.77	4.62	4.41	4.40	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	643/1426	4.85	4.90	4.69	4.71	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	438/1418	4.62	4.58	4.25	4.22	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	511/1416	4.62	4.55	4.26	4.24	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	607/1199	4.08	4.39	3.97	3.95	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	343/1312	4.54	4.54	4.00	3.98	4.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	258/1303	4.85	4.71	4.24	4.23	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	344/1299	4.77	4.77	4.25	4.21	4.77
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	297/ 758	4.27	4.11	4.01	3.89	4.27

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: AMST 310 0101
 Title GENDER AND INEQUALITY
 Instructor: TAYLOR, DABRINA
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 29
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	0	4	7	15	4.07	1065/1504	4.27	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	4	18	4.31	780/1503	4.33	4.40	4.20	4.22	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	26	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1290	****	4.63	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	2	8	16	4.41	594/1453	4.54	4.51	4.21	4.23	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	5	19	4.41	401/1421	4.55	4.46	4.00	4.01	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	9	15	4.36	472/1365	4.45	4.44	4.08	4.08	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	8	5	14	4.07	958/1485	4.27	4.40	4.16	4.17	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	19	10	4.34	1214/1504	4.29	4.55	4.69	4.65	4.34
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	15	8	4.15	751/1483	4.30	4.31	4.06	4.08	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	3	9	12	4.38	930/1425	4.47	4.62	4.41	4.43	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	572/1426	4.89	4.90	4.69	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	4	7	12	4.25	848/1418	4.48	4.58	4.25	4.26	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	2	7	13	4.29	837/1416	4.55	4.55	4.26	4.27	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	1	0	4	4	10	4.16	568/1199	4.34	4.39	3.97	4.02	4.16
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	7	11	4.35	512/1312	4.44	4.54	4.00	4.09	4.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	2	1	16	4.55	535/1303	4.60	4.71	4.24	4.27	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	2	2	15	4.55	537/1299	4.66	4.77	4.25	4.30	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	5	3	3	6	3.59	561/ 758	3.41	4.11	4.01	4.00	3.59
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors

00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	11	Under-grad	29	Non-major	25
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 310 0201
 Title GENDER AND INEQUALITY
 Instructor: TAYLOR, DABRINA
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 30
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	11	18	4.47	609/1504	4.27	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	11	17	4.34	736/1503	4.33	4.40	4.20	4.22	4.34
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	29	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1290	****	4.63	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	10	20	4.67	270/1453	4.54	4.51	4.21	4.23	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	6	24	4.68	206/1421	4.55	4.46	4.00	4.01	4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	6	21	4.53	274/1365	4.45	4.44	4.08	4.08	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	1	1	11	17	4.47	509/1485	4.27	4.40	4.16	4.17	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	2	20	9	4.23	1294/1504	4.29	4.55	4.69	4.65	4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	15	15	4.45	397/1483	4.30	4.31	4.06	4.08	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	10	21	4.56	712/1425	4.47	4.62	4.41	4.43	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	29	4.91	502/1426	4.89	4.90	4.69	4.71	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	25	4.72	317/1418	4.48	4.58	4.25	4.26	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	25	4.81	255/1416	4.55	4.55	4.26	4.27	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	4	3	23	4.52	265/1199	4.34	4.39	3.97	4.02	4.52
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	6	17	4.52	350/1312	4.44	4.54	4.00	4.09	4.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	0	5	19	4.64	469/1303	4.60	4.71	4.24	4.27	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	2	22	4.76	344/1299	4.66	4.77	4.25	4.30	4.76
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	5	1	5	4	6	3.24	652/ 758	3.41	4.11	4.01	4.00	3.24
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: AMST 310 0201
 Title GENDER AND INEQUALITY
 Instructor: TAYLOR, DABRINA
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 30
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	8	Under-grad	33	Non-major	22
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: AMST 320 0101
 Title TV IN AMERICAN CULTURE
 Instructor: HUMMEL, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 31
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	5	9	11	3.96	1132/1504	3.96	4.37	4.27	4.27	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	16	4.39	663/1503	4.39	4.40	4.20	4.22	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	173/1290	4.85	4.63	4.28	4.31	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	21	4.71	222/1453	4.71	4.51	4.21	4.23	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	9	14	4	3.71	986/1421	3.71	4.46	4.00	4.01	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	11	14	4.39	430/1365	4.39	4.44	4.08	4.08	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	9	16	4.43	563/1485	4.43	4.40	4.16	4.17	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	20	4.71	940/1504	4.71	4.55	4.69	4.65	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	18	8	4.21	679/1483	4.21	4.31	4.06	4.08	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	8	15	4.52	760/1425	4.52	4.62	4.41	4.43	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	549/1426	4.88	4.90	4.69	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	8	15	4.52	552/1418	4.52	4.58	4.25	4.26	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	5	17	4.56	564/1416	4.56	4.55	4.26	4.27	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	4	2	17	4.57	236/1199	4.57	4.39	3.97	4.02	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	585/1312	4.27	4.54	4.00	4.09	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	299/1303	4.80	4.71	4.24	4.27	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	243/1299	4.87	4.77	4.25	4.30	4.87
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	319/ 758	4.21	4.11	4.01	4.00	4.21
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	12	Under-grad	28	Non-major	27
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: AMST 320H 0101
 Title TV IN AMERICAN CULTURE
 Instructor: HUMMEL, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 32
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	6	7	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	678/1503	4.39	4.40	4.20	4.22	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	344/1290	4.67	4.63	4.28	4.31	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.51	4.21	4.23	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	3	8	3.94	815/1421	3.94	4.46	4.00	4.01	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	9	5	3.94	854/1365	3.94	4.44	4.08	4.08	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	3	11	4.17	866/1485	4.17	4.40	4.16	4.17	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	394/1504	4.94	4.55	4.69	4.65	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	12	3	3.94	933/1483	3.94	4.31	4.06	4.08	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	818/1425	4.47	4.62	4.41	4.43	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	301/1426	4.94	4.90	4.69	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	552/1418	4.53	4.58	4.25	4.26	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	472/1416	4.65	4.55	4.26	4.27	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	82/1199	4.88	4.39	3.97	4.02	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	290/1312	4.62	4.54	4.00	4.09	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	497/1303	4.62	4.71	4.24	4.27	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	344/1299	4.77	4.77	4.25	4.30	4.77
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	304/ 758	4.25	4.11	4.01	4.00	4.25

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AMST 322 0101
 Title AMER SOCY & CULT IN FI
 Instructor: TAYLOR, DABRINA
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 33
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	14	6	3.96	1132/1504	3.96	4.37	4.27	4.27	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	8	11	4.12	972/1503	4.12	4.40	4.20	4.22	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	18	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	****/1290	****	4.63	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	9	12	4.24	798/1453	4.24	4.51	4.21	4.23	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	9	6	9	3.92	839/1421	3.92	4.46	4.00	4.01	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	9	11	4.20	645/1365	4.20	4.44	4.08	4.08	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	7	5	10	3.96	1038/1485	3.96	4.40	4.16	4.17	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	7	4.28	1255/1504	4.28	4.55	4.69	4.65	4.28
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	0	4	15	2	3.65	1175/1483	3.65	4.31	4.06	4.08	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	688/1425	4.58	4.62	4.41	4.43	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	667/1426	4.83	4.90	4.69	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	6	13	4.29	808/1418	4.29	4.58	4.25	4.26	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	4	5	11	4.04	1015/1416	4.04	4.55	4.26	4.27	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	144/1199	4.73	4.39	3.97	4.02	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	4	5	11	4.24	605/1312	4.24	4.54	4.00	4.09	4.24
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	299/1303	4.81	4.71	4.24	4.27	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	203/1299	4.90	4.77	4.25	4.30	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	4	16	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 758	****	4.11	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	25	Non-major	19
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: AMST 344 0101
 Title MATERIAL CULTURE IN US
 Instructor: KING, PAULA
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 34
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	9	10	4.29	851/1504	4.29	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	324/1503	4.65	4.40	4.20	4.22	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	166/1290	4.86	4.63	4.28	4.31	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	222/1453	4.71	4.51	4.21	4.23	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	151/1421	4.76	4.46	4.00	4.01	4.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	217/1365	4.62	4.44	4.08	4.08	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	16	4.62	339/1485	4.62	4.40	4.16	4.17	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	6	4.29	1255/1504	4.29	4.55	4.69	4.65	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	10	7	4.41	445/1483	4.41	4.31	4.06	4.08	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	331/1425	4.80	4.62	4.41	4.43	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	301/1426	4.95	4.90	4.69	4.71	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	289/1418	4.74	4.58	4.25	4.26	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	407/1416	4.70	4.55	4.26	4.27	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	412/1199	4.36	4.39	3.97	4.02	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	100/1312	4.92	4.54	4.00	4.09	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.71	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	182/1299	4.92	4.77	4.25	4.30	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.11	4.01	4.00	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	7	Under-grad	21	Non-major	13
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 352 0101
 Title AMER CULTURE:GLOBAL PE
 Instructor: MCDERMOTT, PAT
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 35
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	549/1504	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	368/1503	4.62	4.40	4.20	4.22	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	378/1290	4.63	4.63	4.28	4.31	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	385/1453	4.56	4.51	4.21	4.23	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	194/1421	4.70	4.46	4.00	4.01	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	395/1365	4.42	4.44	4.08	4.08	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	402/1485	4.55	4.40	4.16	4.17	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	15	4	4.21	1300/1504	4.21	4.55	4.69	4.65	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	543/1483	4.33	4.31	4.06	4.08	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	90/1425	4.95	4.62	4.41	4.43	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	502/1426	4.90	4.90	4.69	4.71	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	317/1418	4.71	4.58	4.25	4.26	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	310/1416	4.76	4.55	4.26	4.27	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	195/1199	4.63	4.39	3.97	4.02	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	592/1312	4.25	4.54	4.00	4.09	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	755/1303	4.31	4.71	4.24	4.27	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	645/1299	4.44	4.77	4.25	4.30	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	1	0	3	1	7	4.08	377/ 758	4.08	4.11	4.01	4.00	4.08

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	21	Non-major	9
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	2						

Course-Section: AMST 359 0101
 Title ISSUES IN AMERICAN STU
 Instructor: SNYDER, DONALD
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 36
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	6	13	4.39	712/1504	4.39	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	426/1503	4.57	4.40	4.20	4.22	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	201/1290	4.80	4.63	4.28	4.31	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	374/1453	4.57	4.51	4.21	4.23	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	254/1421	4.59	4.46	4.00	4.01	4.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	205/1365	4.64	4.44	4.08	4.08	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	8	13	4.55	412/1485	4.55	4.40	4.16	4.17	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	10	12	4.48	373/1483	4.48	4.31	4.06	4.08	4.48
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	676/1425	4.59	4.62	4.41	4.43	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.90	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	7	14	4.55	526/1418	4.55	4.58	4.25	4.26	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	8	13	4.55	583/1416	4.55	4.55	4.26	4.27	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	149/1199	4.71	4.39	3.97	4.02	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	297/1312	4.60	4.54	4.00	4.09	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	248/1303	4.85	4.71	4.24	4.27	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	203/1299	4.90	4.77	4.25	4.30	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	3	11	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	273/ 758	4.33	4.11	4.01	4.00	4.33
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	9	Under-grad	23	Non-major	17
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				

Course-Section: AMST 372 0101
 Title AMERICAN FOOD
 Instructor: BELASCO, WARREN
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 37
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	12	15	4.45	639/1504	4.45	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	16	13	4.45	587/1503	4.45	4.40	4.20	4.22	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	20	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	459/1290	4.56	4.63	4.28	4.31	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	19	4.62	310/1453	4.62	4.51	4.21	4.23	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	8	19	4.55	283/1421	4.55	4.46	4.00	4.01	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	10	17	4.57	245/1365	4.57	4.44	4.08	4.08	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	21	4.59	370/1485	4.59	4.40	4.16	4.17	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	12	4.41	1164/1504	4.41	4.55	4.69	4.65	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	10	10	4.25	635/1483	4.25	4.31	4.06	4.08	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	7	17	4.43	876/1425	4.43	4.62	4.41	4.43	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	620/1426	4.86	4.90	4.69	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	8	18	4.54	539/1418	4.54	4.58	4.25	4.26	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	6	17	4.39	761/1416	4.39	4.55	4.26	4.27	4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	3	5	20	4.61	213/1199	4.61	4.39	3.97	4.02	4.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	3	8	8	4.05	705/1312	4.05	4.54	4.00	4.09	4.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.71	4.24	4.27	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	344/1299	4.76	4.77	4.25	4.30	4.76
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	2	4	1	5	8	3.65	539/ 758	3.65	4.11	4.01	4.00	3.65

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	12	Under-grad	29	Non-major	26
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 392 0101
 Title STUDIES IN AMER SOCIET
 Instructor: ORSER, EDWARD W
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 38
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	10	16	4.46	609/1504	4.23	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	13	15	4.54	460/1503	4.18	4.40	4.20	4.22	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	356/1290	4.45	4.63	4.28	4.31	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	11	17	4.61	331/1453	4.40	4.51	4.21	4.23	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	3	21	4.67	212/1421	4.54	4.46	4.00	4.01	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	8	16	4.48	321/1365	4.44	4.44	4.08	4.08	4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	11	14	4.44	536/1485	4.37	4.40	4.16	4.17	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	263/1504	4.87	4.55	4.69	4.65	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	10	16	4.50	338/1483	4.20	4.31	4.06	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	209/1425	4.88	4.62	4.41	4.43	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	401/1426	4.90	4.90	4.69	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	11	15	4.58	488/1418	4.51	4.58	4.25	4.26	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	459/1416	4.41	4.55	4.26	4.27	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	3	9	12	4.28	471/1199	4.34	4.39	3.97	4.02	4.28
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	424/1312	4.38	4.54	4.00	4.09	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	563/1303	4.53	4.71	4.24	4.27	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	415/1299	4.57	4.77	4.25	4.30	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	1	0	4	5	9	4.11	375/ 758	4.15	4.11	4.01	4.00	4.11
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	28	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 392 0201
 Title STUDIES IN AMER SOCIET
 Instructor: ORSER, EDWARD W
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 39
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	2	14	10	4.00	1092/1504	4.23	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	3	10	11	3.83	1173/1503	4.18	4.40	4.20	4.22	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	1	0	11	11	4.25	783/1290	4.45	4.63	4.28	4.31	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	4	1	8	14	4.19	855/1453	4.40	4.51	4.21	4.23	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	5	19	4.41	401/1421	4.54	4.46	4.00	4.01	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	8	16	4.39	430/1365	4.44	4.44	4.08	4.08	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	10	14	4.29	727/1485	4.37	4.40	4.16	4.17	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	854/1504	4.87	4.55	4.69	4.65	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	1	6	9	6	3.91	989/1483	4.20	4.31	4.06	4.08	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	239/1425	4.88	4.62	4.41	4.43	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	572/1426	4.90	4.90	4.69	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	2	1	5	15	4.43	669/1418	4.51	4.58	4.25	4.26	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	3	2	15	4.17	937/1416	4.41	4.55	4.26	4.27	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	2	9	11	4.41	369/1199	4.34	4.39	3.97	4.02	4.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	4	8	11	4.30	559/1312	4.38	4.54	4.00	4.09	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	2	3	17	4.57	529/1303	4.53	4.71	4.24	4.27	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	1	4	16	4.43	645/1299	4.57	4.77	4.25	4.30	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	1	4	6	10	4.19	328/ 758	4.15	4.11	4.01	4.00	4.19
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: AMST 392 0201
 Title STUDIES IN AMER SOCIET
 Instructor: ORSER, EDWARD W
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 39
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	8	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	29	Non-major	7
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 490 0101
 Title SENIOR SEMINAR
 Instructor: BELASCO, WARREN
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 40
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1504	4.90	4.37	4.27	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	151/1503	4.42	4.40	4.20	4.18	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1290	****	4.63	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	101/1453	4.70	4.51	4.21	4.22	4.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	449/1421	4.68	4.46	4.00	4.02	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	77/1365	4.83	4.44	4.08	4.09	4.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	88/1485	4.76	4.40	4.16	4.14	4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	1087/1504	4.75	4.55	4.69	4.73	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	700/1483	4.60	4.31	4.06	4.11	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	618/1425	4.69	4.62	4.41	4.38	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	502/1426	4.95	4.90	4.69	4.72	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	303/1418	4.74	4.58	4.25	4.25	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	366/1416	4.74	4.55	4.26	4.26	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	320/1199	4.45	4.39	3.97	4.05	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	111/1312	4.95	4.54	4.00	4.07	4.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	197/1303	4.95	4.71	4.24	4.34	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	203/1299	4.95	4.77	4.25	4.38	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	293/ 758	4.64	4.11	4.01	4.17	4.29
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AMST 490 0201
 Title SENIOR SEMINAR
 Instructor: LOVIGLIO, JASON
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 41
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	206/1504	4.90	4.37	4.27	4.33	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1052/1503	4.42	4.40	4.20	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.63	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	440/1453	4.70	4.51	4.21	4.22	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	4.68	4.46	4.00	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	139/1365	4.83	4.44	4.08	4.09	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	349/1485	4.76	4.40	4.16	4.14	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	4.75	4.55	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1483	4.60	4.31	4.06	4.11	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	420/1425	4.69	4.62	4.41	4.38	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	4.95	4.90	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1418	4.74	4.58	4.25	4.25	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	324/1416	4.74	4.55	4.26	4.26	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1199	4.45	4.39	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1312	4.95	4.54	4.00	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1303	4.95	4.71	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1299	4.95	4.77	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 758	4.64	4.11	4.01	4.17	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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