University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2005

Page 73

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 14 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ART 210 0101

VISUAL CONCEPTS

BRADLEY, STEPHE

Title

Instructor:

							Fr	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	;		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,skil		m this course	0	0	0	2	3	7	2	3.64	1459/1674	3.61	4.32	4.27	4.32	3.64
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	5	4	5	0	3.00	1608/1674	3.27	4.23	4.23	4.26	3.00
		uestions reflect			0	12	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.36	***
4. Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	1313/1609	3.97	4.34	4.22	4.23	3.77
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	7	3	0	3	1	0	2.29	1562/1585	2.87	3.79	3.96	3.91	2.29
6. Did wri	itten as:	signments contri	bute t	o what you learned	0	4	7	2	1	0	0	1.40	1535/1535	2.32	3.68	4.08	4.03	1.40
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	expla	ined	0	0	0	4	7	3	0	2.93	1585/1651	3.31	3.83	4.18	4.20	2.93
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1325/1673	4.62	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.38
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overal	l teac	hing effectiveness	2	1	1	2	4	4	0	3.00	1540/1656	3.27	4.00	4.07	4.10	3.00
11		Lecture	,	0	0	0	0		0	-	2 50	1406/1506	2 01	4 00	4 42	4 40	2 50	
		uctor's lectures		0	0	0	0	4	9	11		1406/1586		4.29	4.43	4.48	3.79	
		ctor seem intere		0	0	0	0	1	2	11		1002/1585		4.76	4.69	4.76	4.71	
		_		xplained clearly	0	0	2	2	6	4	0		1536/1582		4.27	4.26	4.35	2.86
		es contribute to		-	0	0	0	2 1	4	5	1		1477/1575		4.23	4.27	4.39	3.07
5. Did aud	diovisua.	1 techniques enr	ance y	our understanding	0	0	0	Τ	3	7	3	3.86	831/1380	3.83	4.34	3.94	4.03	3.86
		Discuss	ion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contribu	te to	what you learned	1	0	0	1	6	2	4	3.69	1074/1520	3.89	4.17	4.01	4.03	3.69
				d to participate	2	0	1	2	1	1	7	3.92	1125/1515	4.30	4.52	4.24	4.28	3.92
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage f	air an	d open discussion	2	0	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	1177/1511	4.28	4.53	4.27	4.28	3.83
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	sful	-	2	9	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 994	3.50	4.04	3.94	3.98	****
1 544 444	. 1.1. 2	Laborat		E	12	1	0	_	1	0	0	2 00	**** / OCE	****		4 02	4 24	
1. DIG the	e lab in	crease understar	aing o	I the material	12	1	0	0	1	U	U	3.00	****/ 265			4.23	4.34	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Georgia II		G., GD.	True and Augusta				Da		_			m				M = = = = = =		
Credits Ea	arnea 	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades					asons				Ту:	ре 			Majors		
00-27	5	A 2		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0		
28-55	2	в 10																
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h

Other

13

0

0

0

I

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ART 210 0201

18

VISUAL CONCEPTS

BRADLEY, STEPHE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 18

Page 74 JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

- · ·				
Student	('Ollred	Fivaluation	Ouestionnaire	4

			Fr	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	7	0	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	1420/1674	3.61	4.32	4.27	4.32	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	3	7	1	0	2.82	1641/1674	3.27	4.23	4.23	4.26	2.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	1	0	6	4	4.18	941/1609	3.97	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	10	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1585	2.87	3.79	3.96	3.91	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	1	2	1	4	3	0	2.80	1595/1651	3.31	3.83	4.18	4.20	2.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1673	4.62	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	1	4	3	0	3.25	1474/1656	3.27	4.00	4.07	4.10	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1376/1586	3.91	4.29	4.43	4.48	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	1035/1585	4.54	4.76	4.69	4.76	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	1	4	3	1	3.44	1427/1582	3.32	4.27	4.26	4.35	3.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	3	4	1	3.44	1388/1575	3.40	4.23	4.27	4.39	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	666/1380	3.83	4.34	3.94	4.03	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	673/1520	3.89	4.17	4.01	4.03	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	7		483/1515		4.52	4.24	4.28	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	0	7		816/1511	4.28	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 994			3.94	3.98	***
Proces	0000	. Dia	+ m i b		_									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				2	Λ						

 Course-Section:
 ART
 210
 0301
 University of Maryland
 Page
 75

 Title
 VISUAL CONCEPTS
 Baltimore County
 JAN 21, 2006

 Instructor:
 CHAN, IRENE
 Fall
 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires:	19	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Enrollment:

19

Questions									_	ncie	3			tructor		_	UMBC		Sect
1. Did you gain new insights.exills from this course 2 0 1 3 2 6 5 3.65 1459/1674 3.61 4.32 4.27 4.32 3.65 2 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3 0 0 1 6 6 4 3.76 1364/1674 3.27 4.23 4.23 4.26 3.76 3 Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4 Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7 Was the grading system clearly explained 8 Death own any times was class cancelled 9 How many times was class cancelled 1 Did written assignments on the subject 1 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 Did to be instructor seem interested in the subject 2 Did to be instructor seem interested in the subject 3 Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 Did understanding seems of the subject of			Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course 2 0 1 3 2 6 5 3.65 1459/1674 3.61 4.32 4.27 4.32 3.65 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 2 0 0 1 6 6 4 3.76 1364/1674 3.27 4.23 4.23 4.26 3.76 3.01 the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 13 1 0 1 2 0 3.00 ********************************			Genera	 1															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 2 0 0 1 6 6 6 4 3.76 1364/1674 3.27 4.23 4.23 4.26 3.76 3.00 the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 13 1 0 1 2 0 3.00 ****/1423 **** 4.27 4.36 **** 4.26 4.27 4.36 **** 4.26 4.27 4.36 **** 4.27 4.36 **** 4.27 4.36 **** 4.27 4.36 **** 4.27 4.36 **** 4.27 4.36 **** 4.27 4.36 **** 4.27 4.36 **** 4.27 4.36 **** 4.27 4.36 **** 4.27 4.36 **** 4.27 4.36 **** 4.27 4.36 **** 4.27 4.36 **** 4.27 4.36 **** 4.27 4.36 **** 4.27 4.36 **** 4.27 4.36 **** 4.27 4.37 4.36 **** 4.27 4.28 4.26 *** 4.27 4.36	1. Did vo	nı gain ne		_	this course	2	0	1	3	2	6	5	3.65	1459/1674	3.61	4.32	4.27	4.32	3.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 13 1 0 1 2 0 3.00 ******/1423 **** 4.27 4.36 ***** 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 0 2 1 1 4 9 4.00 1094/1609 3.97 4.34 4.22 4.23 4.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 0 3 4 2 4 3 3.00 1440/1595 2.87 3.79 3.96 3.91 3.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 2 2 5 3 4 0 2.64 1500/1535 2.87 3.79 3.96 3.91 3.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 1 5 3 6 3.59 1410/1651 3.31 3.83 4.18 4.20 3.50 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 3 4.18 1477/1673 4.62 4.65 4.69 4.67 4.18 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 2 3 8 0 3.46 1394/1656 3.27 4.00 4.07 4.10 3.46 1.00 4.00 4.07 4.10 3.46 1.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00	_	_	J ,					0	-	6	6	4							
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 0 2 1 1 1 4 9 9 4.00 1094/1609 3.97 4.34 4.22 4.23 4.00 6. Did assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 3 4 2 4 3 3.00 1440/1555 2.87 3.79 3.96 3.91 3.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 2 2 5 3 4 0 2.64 1500/1535 2.32 3.68 4.08 4.03 2.64 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 0 1 5 3 6 3.59 1410/1651 3.31 3.83 4.18 4.20 3.59 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 1 4 3 4.18 1477/1673 4.62 4.65 4.69 4.67 4.18 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 0 2 3 8 0 3.46 1394/1656 3.27 4.00 4.07 4.10 3.46    Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 1 1 2 2 8 5 3.88 1376/1586 3.91 4.29 4.43 4.48 3.88   2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 3 3 3 5 6 3.82 1261/1582 3.32 4.27 4.26 4.35 3.82   4. Did the lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 3 3 3 5 6 3.82 1261/1582 3.32 4.27 4.26 4.35 3.82   4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 0 3 7 5 3.76 1284/1575 3.40 4.23 4.27 4.39 3.76   5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 1 2 0 2 6 5 3.80 866/1380 3.83 4.17 4.01 4.03 3.57   2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 1 0 1 3 7 4.25 889/1515 4.30 4.52 4.24 4.28 4.25   3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 7 0 0 1 0 1 3 7 4.25 889/1515 4.30 4.52 4.24 4.28 4.54   4. Were special techniques successful 6 7 0 1 0 1 3 7 4.25 889/1515 4.30 4.52 4.24 4.28 4.54   4. Were special techniques successful 7 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8							13	1	0	1	2	0		, -					
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 0 3 4 2 4 3 3.00 1440/1585 2.87 3.79 3.96 3.91 3.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 1 5 3 6 0.59 1410/1551 2.32 3.68 4.08 4.03 2.64 7.00		_			-			2	1	1		9		, -					4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 2 2 5 3 4 0 2.64 1500/1535 2.32 3.68 4.08 4.03 2.64 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 2 1 5 3 6 3.59 1410/1651 3.31 3.83 4.18 4.20 3.59 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 14 3 6 3.59 1410/1651 3.31 3.83 4.18 4.20 3.59 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 0 2 3 8 0 3.46 1394/1656 3.27 4.00 4.07 4.10 3.46 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 0 2 3 8 0 3.46 1394/1656 3.27 4.00 4.07 4.10 3.46 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 0 2 3 8 0 3.46 1394/1656 3.27 4.00 4.07 4.10 3.46 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 0 2 3 8 5 3.88 1376/1586 3.91 4.29 4.43 4.48 3.88 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 0 2 3 8 5 3.88 1376/1586 3.91 4.29 4.43 4.48 3.88 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 0 1 0 3 13 4.65 1094/1585 4.54 4.76 4.69 4.76 4.65 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 1 0 3 13 4.65 1094/1585 3.40 4.29 4.43 4.48 3.88 9. How would you grade the overall presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 3 3 5 6 3.82 1261/1582 3.32 4.27 4.26 4.35 3.82 4.10 dthe instructor encourable to what you learned 2 0 2 0 3 7 5 3.76 1284/1575 3.40 4.23 4.27 4.39 3.76 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 1 2 0 2 6 5 3.80 866/1380 3.83 4.34 3.94 4.03 3.80 9. How would you grade the overall techniques successful 5 0 2 0 3 6 3 3.57 1141/1520 3.89 4.17 4.01 4.03 3.57 9. How would you grade the overall techniques successful 6 0 0 0 2 2 9 4.54 618/1511 4.28 4.53 4.27 4.28 4.54 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00											4	3							3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 2 1 5 3 6 3.59 1410/1651 3.31 3.83 4.18 4.20 3.59 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 14 3 4.18 1477/1673 4.62 4.65 4.69 4.67 4.18 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 0 2 3 8 0 3.46 1394/1656 3.27 4.00 4.07 4.10 3.46    Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 1 1 2 8 5 3.88 1376/1586 3.91 4.29 4.43 4.48 3.88 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 1 0 3 13 4.65 1094/1585 4.54 4.76 4.69 4.76 4.65 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 3 3 5 6 3.82 1261/1582 3.32 4.27 4.26 4.35 3.82 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 0 3 7 5 3.76 1284/1575 3.40 4.23 4.27 4.39 3.76 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 1 2 0 2 6 5 3.80 866/1380 3.83 4.34 3.94 4.03 3.80    Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 2 0 3 6 3 3.57 1141/1520 3.89 4.17 4.01 4.03 3.57 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 1 0 1 3 7 4.25 898/1515 4.30 4.52 4.24 4.28 4.25 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 2 2 9 4.54 618/1511 4.28 4.53 4.27 4.28 4.54 4. Were special techniques successful 6 7 1 0 1 3 1 3.50 732/994 3.50 4.04 3.94 3.98 3.50    Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 0 Major 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0									5		4	0		-,				4.03	
8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 14 3 4.18 1477/1673 4.62 4.65 4.69 4.67 4.18 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 2 3 8 0 3.46 1394/1656 3.27 4.00 4.07 4.10 3.46  Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 1 1 2 8 5 3.88 1376/1586 3.91 4.29 4.43 4.48 3.88 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 1 0 3 13 4.65 1094/1585 4.54 4.76 4.69 4.76 4.65 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 3 3 5 6 3.82 1261/1582 3.32 4.27 4.26 4.35 3.82 4.01 4.09 4.06 4.05 5. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 0 3 7 5 3.76 1284/1575 3.40 4.23 4.27 4.39 3.76 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 1 2 0 2 6 5 3.80 866/1380 3.83 4.34 3.94 4.03 3.80  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 2 0 3 6 3 3.57 1141/1520 3.89 4.17 4.01 4.03 3.57 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 1 0 1 3 7 4.25 898/1515 4.30 4.52 4.24 4.28 4.25 4.24 4.28 4						2				5	3	6		,				4.20	
Lecture						2	0	0	0	0	14	3	4.18	1477/1673	4.62	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.18
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 1 1 2 8 5 3.88 1376/1586 3.91 4.29 4.43 4.48 3.88 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 1 0 3 13 4.65 1094/1585 4.54 4.76 4.69 4.76 4.65 3.88 alterial presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 3 3 5 6 3.82 1261/1582 3.32 4.27 4.26 4.35 3.82 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 0 3 7 5 3.76 1284/1575 3.40 4.23 4.27 4.39 3.76 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 1 2 0 2 6 5 3.80 866/1380 3.83 4.34 3.94 4.03 3.80    Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 2 0 3 6 3 3.57 1141/1520 3.89 4.17 4.01 4.03 3.57 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 1 0 1 3 7 4.25 898/1515 4.30 4.52 4.24 4.28 4.25 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 2 2 9 4.54 618/1511 4.28 4.53 4.27 4.28 4.54 4. Were special techniques successful  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 1 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 7 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 19 Non-major 5		-			ing effectiveness	6	0	0	2	3	8	0	3.46	1394/1656		4.00	4.07	4.10	3.46
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 1 1 2 8 5 3.88 1376/1586 3.91 4.29 4.43 4.48 3.88 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 1 0 3 13 4.65 1094/1585 4.54 4.76 4.69 4.76 4.65 3.88 alterial presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 3 3 5 6 3.82 1261/1582 3.32 4.27 4.26 4.35 3.82 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 0 3 7 5 3.76 1284/1575 3.40 4.23 4.27 4.39 3.76 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 1 2 0 2 6 5 3.80 866/1380 3.83 4.34 3.94 4.03 3.80    Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 2 0 3 6 3 3.57 1141/1520 3.89 4.17 4.01 4.03 3.57 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 1 0 1 3 7 4.25 898/1515 4.30 4.52 4.24 4.28 4.25 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 2 2 9 4.54 618/1511 4.28 4.53 4.27 4.28 4.54 4. Were special techniques successful  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 1 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 7 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 19 Non-major 5				_															
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 1 0 3 13 4.65 1094/1585 4.54 4.76 4.69 4.76 4.65 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 3 3 5 6 3.82 1261/1582 3.32 4.27 4.26 4.35 3.82 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 0 3 7 5 3.76 1284/1575 3.40 4.23 4.27 4.39 3.76 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 1 2 0 2 6 5 3.80 866/1380 3.83 4.34 3.94 4.03 3.80 Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 2 0 3 6 3 3.57 1141/1520 3.89 4.17 4.01 4.03 3.57 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 1 0 1 3 7 4.25 898/1515 4.30 4.52 4.24 4.28 4.25 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 2 2 9 4.54 618/1511 4.28 4.53 4.27 4.28 4.54 4. Were special techniques successful 6 7 1 0 1 3 1 3.50 732/994 3.50 4.04 3.94 3.98 3.50  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  O0-27 3 0.00-0.99 1 A 8 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 7 General 0 Under-grad 19 Non-major 5			Lecture																
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 3 3 5 6 3.82 1261/1582 3.32 4.27 4.26 4.35 3.82 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 0 3 7 5 3.76 1284/1575 3.40 4.23 4.27 4.39 3.76 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 1 2 0 2 6 5 3.80 866/1380 3.83 4.34 3.94 4.03 3.80   Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 2 0 3 6 3 3.57 1141/1520 3.89 4.17 4.01 4.03 3.57 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 1 0 1 3 7 4.25 898/1515 4.30 4.52 4.24 4.28 4.25 4.2	1. Were t	he instru	repared	2	0	1	1	2	8	5	3.88	1376/1586	3.91	4.29	4.43	4.48	3.88		
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 0 3 7 5 3.76 1284/1575 3.40 4.23 4.27 4.39 3.76 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 1 2 0 2 6 5 3.80 866/1380 3.83 4.34 3.94 4.03 3.80  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 2 0 3 6 3 3.57 1141/1520 3.89 4.17 4.01 4.03 3.57 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 1 0 1 3 7 4.25 898/1515 4.30 4.52 4.24 4.28 4.25 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 0 2 2 9 4.54 618/1511 4.28 4.53 4.27 4.28 4.54 4. Were special techniques successful 6 7 1 0 1 3 1 3.50 732/994 3.50 4.04 3.94 3.98 3.50  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 3 0.00-0.99 1 A 8 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 7 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 19 Non-major 5	2. Did th	ne instruc	the subject	2	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	1094/1585	4.54	4.76	4.69	4.76	4.65		
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 1 2 0 2 6 5 3.80 866/1380 3.83 4.34 3.94 4.03 3.80  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 2 0 3 6 3 3.57 1141/1520 3.89 4.17 4.01 4.03 3.57 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 1 0 1 3 7 4.25 898/1515 4.30 4.52 4.24 4.28 4.25 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 2 2 9 4.54 618/1511 4.28 4.53 4.27 4.28 4.54 4. Were special techniques successful 6 7 1 0 1 3 1 3.50 732/994 3.50 4.04 3.94 3.98 3.50  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 3 0.00-0.99 1 A 8 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 7 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 19 Non-major 5	3. Was le	cture mat	plained clearly	2	0	0	3	3	5	6	3.82	1261/1582	3.32	4.27	4.26	4.35	3.82		
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 2 0 3 6 3 3.57 1141/1520 3.89 4.17 4.01 4.03 3.57  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 1 0 1 3 7 4.25 898/1515 4.30 4.52 4.24 4.28 4.25  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 2 2 9 4.54 618/1511 4.28 4.53 4.27 4.28 4.54  4. Were special techniques successful 6 7 1 0 1 3 1 3.50 732/ 994 3.50 4.04 3.94 3.98 3.50  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 3 0.00-0.99 1 A 8 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 7 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 19 Non-major 5	4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute to	o what y	ou learned	2	0	2	0	3	7	5	3.76	1284/1575	3.40	4.23	4.27	4.39	3.76
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 2 0 3 6 3 3.57 1141/1520 3.89 4.17 4.01 4.03 3.57 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 1 0 1 3 7 4.25 898/1515 4.30 4.52 4.24 4.28 4.25 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 2 2 9 4.54 618/1511 4.28 4.53 4.27 4.28 4.54 4. Were special techniques successful 6 7 1 0 1 3 1 3.50 732/994 3.50 4.04 3.94 3.98 3.50  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 3 0.00-0.99 1 A 8 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 7 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 19 Non-major 5	5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	nance yo	ur understanding	3	1	2	0	2	6	5	3.80	866/1380	3.83	4.34	3.94	4.03	3.80
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 2 0 3 6 3 3.57 1141/1520 3.89 4.17 4.01 4.03 3.57 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 1 0 1 3 7 4.25 898/1515 4.30 4.52 4.24 4.28 4.25 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 2 2 9 4.54 618/1511 4.28 4.53 4.27 4.28 4.54 4. Were special techniques successful 6 7 1 0 1 3 1 3.50 732/994 3.50 4.04 3.94 3.98 3.50  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 3 0.00-0.99 1 A 8 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 7 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 19 Non-major 5																			
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 1 0 1 3 7 4.25 898/1515 4.30 4.52 4.24 4.28 4.25 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 2 2 9 4.54 618/1511 4.28 4.53 4.27 4.28 4.54 4. Were special techniques successful 6 7 1 0 1 3 1 3.50 732/994 3.50 4.04 3.94 3.98 3.50 Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 3 0.00-0.99 1 A 8 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 7 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 19 Non-major 5			Discus	sion															
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 2 2 9 4.54 618/1511 4.28 4.53 4.27 4.28 4.54 4. Were special techniques successful 6 7 1 0 1 3 1 3.50 732/994 3.50 4.04 3.94 3.98 3.50  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 3 0.00-0.99 1 A 8 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 7 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 19 Non-major 5	1. Did cl	ass discu	assions contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	5	0	2	0	3	6	3	3.57	1141/1520	3.89	4.17	4.01	4.03	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful 6 7 1 0 1 3 1 3.50 732/994 3.50 4.04 3.94 3.98 3.50  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	2. Were a	all studer	nts actively en	couraged	to participate	7	0				3	7	4.25	898/1515	4.30	4.52	4.24	4.28	4.25
Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors			_		open discussion	6					2							4.28	4.54
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		6	7	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	732/ 994	3.50	4.04	3.94	3.98	3.50
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors																			
00-27 3 0.00-0.99 1 A 8 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 7 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 19 Non-major 5					Frequ	lency	/ Dis	trib	atio	n									
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 7 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 19 Non-major 5	Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 7 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 19 Non-major 5	00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A 8		Re	 quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor:	 S	0	Graduat	 e	0	Maio	or	0
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 19 Non-major 5		1									J ·						5		-
								nera:	L				0	Under-q	rad 1	.9	Non-	major	5
04-13U U 3.UU-3.49 1 D U	84-150	-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0												J				-	
Grad. 0 $3.50-4.00$ 0 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough	Grad.	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	jh		
P 0 responses to be significant					P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
I 0 Other 16					I 0		Otl	her				1	6	-					
? 0					? 0														

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ART 210 0401

17

VISUAL CONCEPTS

SHIFLET, NICOLE

Title

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

Ρ

I

?

0

0

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

Fall 2005

Page 76 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Student Cour	se Evaluation	Questionnaire
--------------	---------------	---------------

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	1	2	2	5	2	3.42	1541/1674	3.61	4.32	4.27	4.32	3.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	1499/1674	3.27	4.23	4.23	4.26	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	10	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	1	0	3	3	5	3.92	1211/1609	3.97	4.34	4.22	4.23	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	6	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	1329/1585	2.87	3.79	3.96	3.91	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	2	6	1	1	2.91	1470/1535	2.32	3.68	4.08	4.03	2.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	1214/1651	3.31	3.83	4.18	4.20	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	706/1673	4.62	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	5	5	0	3.36	1434/1656	3.27	4.00	4.07	4.10	3.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	1260/1586	3.91	4.29	4.43	4.48	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	2	4	5		1458/1585		4.76	4.69	4.76	4.08
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	1	4	3	2		1486/1582		4.27	4.26	4.35	3.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	5	3	2		1423/1575		4.23	4.27	4.39	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	1	3	3	4		962/1380		4.34	3.94		3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	780/1520		4.17	4.01	4.03	4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	798/1515		4.52	4.24	4.28	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	751/1511		4.53	4.27	4.28	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 994	3.50	4.04	3.94	3.98	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ution	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 6		Rec	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 S	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 4														
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 2 C 1		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	7	Non-	major	6
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0														

Electives

11

Other

#### Course-Section: ART 211 0101 University of Maryland Page 77 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Silberg, Steven

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	eque	ncie	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	 I															
1 Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil	_	this course	3	0	1	0	1	1	9	4.42	751/1674	4.33	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.42
		ctor make clear			3	0	0	0	0	7	-		721/1674	4.64		4.23		4.42
		uestions reflect			3	1	0	0	1	2	8		417/1423		4.27	4.27		4.64
	_	uations reflect			3	0	0	0	1	0			157/1609	4.73	4.34	4.22	4.23	
			_	what you learned	3	0	1	3	4	3			1440/1585	3.49	3.79	3.96	3.91	
	_	_		what you learned	3	1	1	3	3	4			1470/1535	3.33	3.68	4.08	4.03	
		g system clearly		-	3	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	1044/1651	4.25	3.83	4.18	4.20	4.08
		was class cance			4	0	0	0	0	10	1	4.09	1529/1673	4.63	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.09
	-			ning effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	1			561/1656			4.07	4.10	4.38
		Lecture																
1 Were t	the instri	repared	2	0	0	0	3	2	7	4 33	1074/1586	4.42	4.29	4.43	4.48	A 33		
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92		4.86	4.76	4.69	4.76	4.92
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clea					0	0	0	1	7		4.25	,	4.49	4.27	4.26	4.35	
	Was lecture material presented and explained clear Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	1	0	2	3			1107/1575	4.36	4.23	4.27		4.08
			-	our understanding	3	1	1	0	1	2			472/1380				4.03	
3. 21a a.	uarovibua.	r ccommingaco cm	idiloc 7	our underpounding		_	_	ŭ	_	_	•		1,2,1300	11.10	1.51	3.71	1.05	1.27
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cl	lass discu	ussions contribu	ite to v	what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	645/1520	4.32	4.17	4.01	4.03	4.25
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively end	couraged	d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	289/1515	4.78	4.52	4.24	4.28	4.83
3. Did th	he instruc	ctor encourage i	fair and	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	414/1511	4.67	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.75
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	ssful		3	9	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 994	3.29	4.04	3.94	3.98	****
				Frequ	0000	. Diat	- w i bı	.+	_									
				riequ	lency	DISC		10101	11									
Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	 quire	ed f	or Ma	 aior		0	Graduat		0	Majo	r	0
28-55						100	1411	-u -	J_ 110	2,01	5	•	Gradace	_	Ü	114 )0	_	Ü
56-83						Ger	neral	L				1	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	7
84-150	4-150 2 3.00-3.49 2 D 0												- 2- 5		-			•
Grad.	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enouo	h		
		P 0									respons				_			
				I 0		Oth	ner					9	-					
				? 0														

#### Course-Section: ART 211 0201 University of Maryland Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006

Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 15

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 78

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 L															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	854/1674	4.33	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.33
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	379/1674	4.64	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.67
3. Did th	ie exam qi	estions reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	9	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	376/1423	4.71	4.27	4.27	4.36	4.67
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	374/1609	4.73	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.60
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	1	0	0	2	5	2	5	3.71	1084/1585	3.49	3.79	3.96	3.91	3.71
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	3	1	2	4	1	4	3.42	1328/1535	3.33	3.68	4.08	4.03	3.42
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly	/ expla	ined	0	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	768/1651	4.25	3.83	4.18	4.20	4.33
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	887/1673	4.63	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.80
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	912/1656	4.30	4.00	4.07	4.10	4.08
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectures		prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	1074/1586	4.42	4.29	4.43	4.48	4.33
		tor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	960/1585	4.86	4.76	4.69	4.76	4.73
					0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	777/1582	4.49	4.27	4.26	4.35	4.40
	Was lecture material presented and explained clear Oid the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	819/1575	4.36	4.23	4.27	4.39	4.40
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	284/1380	4.48	4.34	3.94	4.03	4.53
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al	ace dieci			what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	645/1520	4 32	4.17	4.01	4.03	4.25
				d to participate	3	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	560/1515	4.78	4.52	4.24	4.28	4.58
				d open discussion	3	0	1	0	2	1	8	4.25	896/1511	4.67	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.25
		echniques succes		a open arseassion	3	6	1	2	1	0	2		881/ 994			3.94		3.00
	_																	
				Frequ	lency	7 Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 11		Red	auir	ed f	or Ma	ior		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0			110	-10-1-	-	01 110	.,	~	•	OI adda o	_	•	1100 ) 0	-	ŭ
56-83						Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	5
84-150													5				3	
Grad.						Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	<sub>j</sub> h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her				1	.2	_		_			
				? 0														

Course-Section: ART 211 0301

VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM

Title Instructor: Silberg, Steven

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 16

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 79 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General					_	_					054/4654					
_	_	w insights,ski			4	0	1	1	0	2	8	4.25	954/1674		4.32	4.27	4.32	4.25
		tor make clear			4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	191/1674		4.23	4.23	4.26	4.83
		estions reflect			4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	181/1423		4.27	4.27	4.36	4.83
		ations reflect			4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	222/1609		4.34	4.22	4.23	4.75
				nat you learned	4	0	0	1	3	6	2		1049/1585		3.79	3.96	3.91	3.75
				what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	8	1		1207/1535		3.68	4.08	4.03	3.67
		system clearly		ned	4	0	0	0	1	6		4.33	768/1651		3.83	4.18	4.20	4.33
	-	was class cance			4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673		4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overal	ll teach:	ing effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	451/1656	4.30	4.00	4.07	4.10	4.45
		Lecture	2															
1 Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures		renared	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	774/1586	4.42	4.29	4.43	4.48	4.58
		tor seem inter	_	-	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92			4.76	4.69	4.76	4.92
				plained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83			4.27	4.26	4.35	4.83
		s contribute to			4	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58			4.23	4.27	4.39	4.58
				ur understanding	5	0	0	0	1	2			220/1380		4.34		4.03	
J. DIG au	ulovisuai	techniques em	lance you	ar understanding	5	U	U	U		2	0	4.04	220/1300	4.40	4.34	3.34	4.03	4.04
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contribu	ite to wl	nat you learned	5	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	454/1520	4.32	4.17	4.01	4.03	4.45
				to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	207/1515	4.78	4.52	4.24	4.28	4.91
3. Did th	e instruct	tor encourage i	fair and	open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1511	4.67	4.53	4.27	4.28	5.00
		chniques succes			5	4	0	3	0	1	3	3.57	708/ 994	3.29	4.04	3.94	3.98	3.57
		_ ,																
מיד בים נ	- 1-b do-	Laborat	-	+la 1	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	г оо	****/ 265	****	++++	4.23	1 21	****
		rease understar						0		0	_		,		0 75		4.34	****
				round information		0	0	-	0	•	1		****/ 278		2.75	4.19	4.36	****
	_			r lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 260			4.46	4.51	
4. Did th	e lab ins	tructor provide	e assista	ance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.42	****
		Semina	r															
1. Were a	ssigned to			announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.51	4.41	4.07	****
				vidual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 101	****	4.69	4.48	4.45	****
				nat you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 95		4.50	4.31	4.33	****
	_	ns contribute t		_	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 99		4.33	4.39	4.22	****
_		or grading made		you rearried	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97		4.27	4.14	4.63	****
J. Were e	riccria r	Field				Ü	Ü	J	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	, , ,		1.27		1.05	
1. Did fi	eld exper	ience contribut		at you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.75	3.98	3.97	***
		understand you			15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	4.20	***
		tor available 1			15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.50	****
		could you disc			15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.50	****
	_	help you carry	-		15	0	0	0	0	0	-		****/ 49		****	4.27	4.82	****
			,			y Dis			on				,					
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected Grades					easor	ns			T	уре			Major	`s
00-27	3 2	0.00-0.99	2 0	A 2 B 9		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55 56-83	1	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Cos	nera]	1				0	Under-9	rad 1	.6	Mon	-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		Gel	пста.	L				U	onder-9	rau 1	. 0	NOII-	ilia JUL	5
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		יום.	ectiv	700				0	#### -	Meana +	here a	ra not	anaira	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	Τ.	Р 0		ът(	=C(T)	v C S				U	#### - respons				_	111
				I 0		O+1	her				1	1	respons	בס נט ג	e sidii	.rrrcal	10	
				? 0		ULI	TICI											
				; U														

Course-Section: ART 212 0101 University of Maryland Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D Baltimore County

Instructor: DROGOUL, LAURE Fall 2005

Enrollment: 13

Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 80

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

				Fre	quen	cies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	R	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from thi	s course 0	0	0	2.	3	4	2	0	2.55	1664/1674	3.49	4.32	4.27	4.32	2.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expecte		0	0	3	4	4	0	0		1671/1674	3.30	4.23	4.23	4.26	2.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expect	_	0	9	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expecte	d goals 0	0	2	1	4	1	2	1	2.78	1591/1609	3.76	4.34	4.22	4.23	2.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what	you learned 0	0	10	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1585	4.29	3.79	3.96	3.91	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to wha	t you learned 0	0	7	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	1520/1535	2.25	3.68	4.08	4.03	2.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	5	1	2	1	0	1.89	1647/1651	3.28	3.83	4.18	4.20	1.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	2	4.09	1529/1673	4.14	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching	effectiveness 5	5	0	2	2	1	1	0	2.17	1638/1656	3.39	4.00	4.07	4.10	2.17
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepa	rod 1	1	0	2	2	4	1	1	2 70	1565/1586	3.65	4.29	4.43	4.48	2.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the		1	0	0	Δ	0	7	8	4.80	811/1585	4.87	4.76	4.43	4.46	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explai	-	1	0	2	1	4	2	1		1530/1582	3.75	4.27	4.09	4.35	2.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you l	-	1 1	0	2	0	5	2	1		1487/1575	3.73	4.23	4.27	4.39	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your u		1	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	666/1380	4.50	4.34	3.94	4.03	4.00
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your d	inderstanding i	L	U	_	U	4	4	5	4.00	000/1360	4.50	4.34	3.74	4.03	4.00
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what	you learned 1	1	0	0	2	4	3	1	3.30	1266/1520	3.98	4.17	4.01	4.03	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to	participate 1	1	0	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	993/1515	4.51	4.52	4.24	4.28	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and ope	n discussion 1	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	845/1511	4.65	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	7	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	474/ 994	4.10	4.04	3.94	3.98	4.00
	Frequenc	су	Dist	ribu	tion										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Ex	pected Grades				Rea	sons				Туј	pe			Majors	

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

Course-Section: ART 212 0201 Title

University of Maryland VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D Baltimore County Fall 2005

Instructor: NOHE, TIM

Enrollment: 19

Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 81 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	2	0	0	1	-1	4	1.0	4 44	710/1674	2 40	4 20	4 07	4 20	4 44
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	719/1674		4.32	4.27	4.32	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	Ţ	3	11	4.50	578/1674	3.30	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	13	0	0	0	1	2		****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	222/1609	3.76	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	9	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	530/1585	4.29	3.79	3.96	3.91	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	12	1	0	0	0	3		****/1535	2.25	3.68	4.08	4.03	****
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	3	1	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	330/1651	3.28	3.83	4.18	4.20	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	13	3		1470/1673	4.14	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	301/1656	3.39	4.00	4.07	4.10	4.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	753/1586	3.65	4.29	4.43	4.48	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	397/1585	4.87	4.76	4.69	4.76	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	525/1582	3.75	4.27	4.26	4.35	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	886/1575	3.67	4.23	4.27	4.39	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1380	4.50	4.34	3.94	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	295/1520	3.98	4.17	4.01	4.03	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	186/1515	4.51	4.52	4.24	4.28	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1511	4.65	4.53	4.27	4.28	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	390/ 994	4.10	4.04	3.94	3.98	4.20
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.75	3.98	3.97	****
Frequ	encv	. Dis	trib	ıt i oı	า									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General		Under-grad	19	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	15	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ART 213 0101

Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D

Instructor: COOK, CATHY

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 16

Fall 2005

Page 82 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	671/1674	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	641/1674	3.76	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	673/1609	3.83	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	7	0	5		1156/1585		3.79	3.96	3.91	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	11	0	0	2	0	0		****/1535		3.68	4.08	4.03	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	1	2	4 0	4	1		1544/1651		3.83	4.18	4.20	3.17
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3 4	0	0	0	0	0 7	13 5	5.00 4.42	1/1673 507/1656		4.65	4.69 4.07	4.67 4.10	5.00 4.42
	_	-			-		_		,					
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	8	3		1211/1586		4.29	4.43	4.48	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0 2	1 5	11 5	4.92	510/1585		4.76	4.69	4.76	4.92 4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	-	4.25	935/1582 601/1575		4.27 4.23	4.26 4.27	4.35 4.39	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	2		4.83					4.03	
Discussion		_	_			_	_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	572/1520		4.17	4.01	4.03	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4 4	0	0	0	0 1	6 2	6 9	4.50 4.67	629/1515 507/1511		4.52 4.53	4.24 4.27	4.28 4.28	4.50 4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	4	10	0	0	0	0	-		****/ 994			3.94		****
	-		Ü	ŭ	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	, , , , , ,	3.73		3.71	3.70	
Laboratory	1 -	^	0	0	0	0	1	г оо	++++/ 265	****	****	4 02	1 21	++++
<ol> <li>Did the lab increase understanding of the material</li> <li>Were you provided with adequate background information</li> </ol>	15 15	0	0	0	0	0	1 1		****/ 265 ****/ 278		2.75	4.23	4.34 4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 260		****	4.46	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 259		***		4.42	****
-														
Seminar		_	_	_	_		_							
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0 1	1		****/ 99 ****/ 97		4.33	4.39	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	U	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	****/ 97		4.27	4.14	4.63	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15 15	0	0	1	0 1	0	0		****/ 76 ****/ 77		2.75 ****	3.98	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	U	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	***/ //			3.93	4.20	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	4.23	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	ıtior	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Pes	asons				ጥ፣	фe			Majors	
Expected Grades						, 								
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 8		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	S	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 2 C 0		Cos	neral					0	Under-c	mad 1	.6	Non	major	12
84-150 5 3.00-3.49 1 D 0		Gei	ier al	-				U	onder-g	jiau 1	.0	NOII-	illa JOF	12
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
P 0		-								ses to b			_	
I 0		Otl	ner				1	3						
? 0														

Course-Section: ART 213 0201

University of Maryland VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D

Instructor: Eby, Chad

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 14

Title

Fall 2005

Page 83 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Baltimore County

			Fre	eauer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	367/1674		4.32	4.27	4.32	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	215/1674	3.76	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	173/1609	3.83	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	4	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1006/1585	3.28	3.79	3.96	3.91	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	2	3	1	0	3	2.89	1473/1535	2.61	3.68	4.08	4.03	2.89
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	5	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	768/1651	3.14	3.83	4.18	4.20	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1673	4.90	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	127/1656	3.61	4.00	4.07	4.10	4.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	214/1586	4.09	4.29	4.43	4.48	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1585	4.70	4.76	4.69	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	246/1582	3.90	4.27	4.26	4.35	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	279/1575	3.82	4.23	4.27	4.39	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	79/1380	4.26	4.34	3.94	4.03	4.90
1														
Discussion	-	0	0	0	0	2	_	4 60	005/1500	4 01	4 1 7	4 01	4 02	4 67
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	•	0	0	3	6	4.67	295/1520	4.01	4.17	4.01	4.03	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	360/1515	4.18	4.52	4.24	4.28	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0 5	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1511	4.23	4.53	4.27	4.28	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	U	U	0	2	2	4.50	205/ 994	3.75	4.04	3.94	3.98	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.34	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 278	****	2.75	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.42	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.48	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.69	4.48	4.45	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 99	****	4.33	4.39	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.27	4.14	4.63	****
Field Work	1 2	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 76	****	0.75	2 00	2 07	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76 ****/ 77	++++	2.75	3.98	3.97 4.20	++++
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13		0	0	1	0	-	3.00	****/ 53	****	****			****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0				-	0	3.00	,	****	****	4.45	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48 ****/ 49	****	****	4.12	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	U	U	U	1	U	0	3.00	****/ 49	***	* * * *	4.27	4.82	^ ^ ^ ^
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	4.23	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.26	4.53	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	4.42	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.50	****

Course-Section: ART 213 0201

Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D

Instructor: Eby, Chad

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 83 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: ART 213 0301 University of Maryland
Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D Baltimore County
Instructor: BRADLEY, STEPHE Fall 2005

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 15

16

University of Maryland Page 84
Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course	Evaluation	Onestionnaire

				Fre	eque	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	2	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	1066/1674	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.15
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	2	0	1	2	4	5	1	3.23	1579/1674	3.76	4.23	4.23	4.26	3.23
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	2	11	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.36	***
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	2	0	2	2	4	4	1	3.00	1557/1609	3.83	4.34	4.22	4.23	3.00
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	6	2	1	3	1	0	2.43	1551/1585	3.28	3.79	3.96	3.91	2.43
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	2	4	4	1	1	3	0	2.33	1518/1535	2.61	3.68	4.08	4.03	2.33
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	2	0	3	3	3	4	0	2.62	1606/1651	3.14	3.83	4.18	4.20	2.62
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1673	4.90	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	2	5	4	0	3.18	1500/1656	3.61	4.00	4.07	4.10	3.18
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	5	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1371/1586	4.09	4.29	4.43	4.48	3.90
		ctor seem inter			5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	567/1585		4.76	4.69	4.76	4.90
				xplained clearly	5	0	0	2	2	6	0	3.40	1442/1582	3.90	4.27	4.26	4.35	3.40
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	2	2	5	1	3.50	1367/1575	3.82	4.23	4.27	4.39	3.50
5. Did au	<ul> <li>Did the lectures contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding</li> </ul>						1	1	0	3	5	4.00	666/1380	4.26	4.34	3.94	4.03	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	760/1520	4.01	4.17	4.01	4.03	4.13
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	7	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	898/1515	4.18	4.52	4.24	4.28	4.25
				d open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	896/1511	4.23	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.25
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful	-	7	4	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	881/ 994	3.75	4.04	3.94	3.98	3.00
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	'own od	Cum. GPA		Errogtod Crodog				Do	2020				т.	~~			Majaza	
	arned	Expected Grades					asons				Ту	pe 			Majors	; 		
00-27						Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55																		
56-83						Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	L5	Non-	major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	βh
Р 0													respons	es to b	oe sign	ificar	ıt	
		I 0		Ot]	her				1	.3								

? 2

Course-Section: ART 213 0401 University of Maryland Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D Baltimore County Fall 2005

Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 85

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	3	4	3.62	1474/1674	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.32	3.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	5	3	3	0	2.54	1660/1674	3.76	4.23	4.23	4.26	2.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	2	2	3.15	1539/1609	3.83	4.34	4.22	4.23	3.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1585	3.28	3.79	3.96	3.91	***
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1535	2.61	3.68	4.08	4.03	***
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	3	4	2	0	2	2.45	1615/1651	3.14	3.83	4.18	4.20	2.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	1124/1673	4.90	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	5	3	3	1	0	2.00	1641/1656	3.61	4.00	4.07	4.10	2.00
Taskinsa														
Lecture	0	0	1	1	_	2	2	2 20	1500/1506	4 00	4 00	1 12	4 40	2 20
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	2	2	3		1502/1586		4.29	4.43	4.48	3.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	2 5	3	6		1472/1585		4.76	4.69	4.76	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	Τ	•	5	_	-	2	2		1486/1582		4.27	4.26	4.35	3.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	3	2	1			1554/1575	3.82	4.23	4.27	4.39	2.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	U	Τ	3	Τ	/	Τ	3.31	1142/1380	4.26	4.34	3.94	4.03	3.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	1	4	1	2.91	1415/1520	4.01	4.17	4.01	4.03	2.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	3	1	1	4	3.18	1397/1515	4.18	4.52	4.24	4.28	3.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	5	3	1	2	3.00	1420/1511	4.23	4.53	4.27	4.28	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	10	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 994	3.75	4.04	3.94	3.98	****
	_	_ 0	,	,	_	,	Ŭ	2.00	, ,,,,,	27.5	01	,-	2.70	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ART 214 0101 University of Maryland Page 86
Title DRAWING I Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: GARDNER, SYMMES Fall 2005
Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 16 Student Course Evaluation Questionn	Ouestionnaires:	16	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnai
--	-----------------	----	---------	--------	------------	-------------

? 1

							Fre	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera																
1 Did vo	u gain n	Genera ew insights,ski	_	m this source	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	342/1674	4.59	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.71
_	_	ctor make clear			2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	406/1674		4.23	4.27	4.26	4.64
		uestions reflec		-	2	13	0	0	0	0	1		****/1423		4.27	4.23	4.36	****
	_	uations reflect		_	2	13	0	0	0	5	υ Τ	4.64	333/1609		4.34	4.27	4.23	4.64
				what you learned	2	0	0	0	6	4	4	3.86	956/1585		3.79	3.96	3.91	3.86
				o what you learned	2	12	0	0	2	0	0		****/1535		3.79	4.08	4.03	****
		g system clearl		_	2	3	0	3	4	2	2		1520/1651		3.83	4.18	4.03	3.27
		g system crearr was class canc		Inea	2	0	0	0	0	0	2 14	5.00	1/1673		4.65	4.18		5.00
	-				4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67			4.00	4.69	4.67	
9. HOW WO	ura you g	grade the overa	II teac	hing effectiveness	4	U	U	U	U	4	8	4.6/	25//1656	4.43	4.00	4.07	4.10	4.67
		Lectur	e															
1. Were ti	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	7	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	945/1586	4.64	4.29	4.43	4.48	4.44
		ctor seem inter			7	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1585		4.76	4.69	4.76	5.00
				xplained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	1	7		438/1582		4.27	4.26	4.35	4.67
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	1	1	7	4.67	495/1575		4.23	4.27	4.39	4.67
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandin					4	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	241/1380			3.94	4.03	4.60
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	512/1520	4.44	4.17	4.01	4.03	4.40
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	6	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	543/1515	4.51	4.52	4.24	4.28	4.60
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	563/1511	4.63	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.60
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		6	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	4.04	3.94	3.98	****
				Frequ	lency	7 Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 11		Red	anir	ed f	or Ma		·	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo		0
28-55						1000	-1 WIII .	- L	O1 110		2	•	Gradat	_	~	11000	-	0
56-83						Gei	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0				_				-	011001 9			2.011		ŭ
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	h
	-	2.22 2.00	_	P 0									respons				_	
	I O						her					9			3			
						- 0-						-						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Questionnaires: 14

Course-Section: ART 214 0201 Page 87 Title DRAWING I JAN 21, 2006 Instructor: McConville, Mat Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	558/1674	4.59	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	790/1674		4.23	4.23	4.26	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	312/1609	4.63	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1585	3.86	3.79	3.96	3.91	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	4	1	2	0	1	3	3.43	1476/1651	3.65	3.83	4.18	4.20	3.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1673	4.92	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	680/1656	4.43	4.00	4.07	4.10	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	753/1586	4.64	4.29	4.43	4.48	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	998/1582	4.57	4.27	4.26	4.35	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	579/1575	4.70	4.23	4.27	4.39	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	3	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1380	4.60	4.34	3.94	4.03	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	572/1520	4.44	4.17	4.01	4.03	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	827/1515	4.51	4.52	4.24	4.28	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	642/1511	4.63	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 994	****	4.04	3.94	3.98	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	ı									

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	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 214 0301 University of Maryland Title DRAWING I

Lecture

5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified

Baltimore County Fall 2005

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

PENNY, JOHN E Instructor: Enrollment: 14

Questionnaires: 13

Page JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	607/1674	4.59	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	408/1609	4.63	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.57

1	11	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1585	3.86	3.79	3.96	3.91	****
1	4	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	866/1651	3.65	3.83	4.18	4.20	4.25
1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	958/1673	4.92	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.75
1	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	615/1656	4.43	4.00	4.07	4.10	4.33
	1 1	1 4 1 0	1 4 0 1 0 0	1 4 0 0 1 0 0 0	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1 4 0 0 2 2 1 0 0 0 0 3	1 4 0 0 2 2 4 1 0 0 0 0 3 9	1 4 0 0 2 2 4 4.25 1 0 0 0 0 3 9 4.75	1 4 0 0 2 2 4 4.25 866/1651 1 0 0 0 0 3 9 4.75 958/1673	1 4 0 0 2 2 4 4.25 866/1651 3.65 1 0 0 0 0 3 9 4.75 958/1673 4.92	1 4 0 0 2 2 4 4.25 866/1651 3.65 3.83 1 0 0 0 0 3 9 4.75 958/1673 4.92 4.65	1 4 0 0 2 2 4 4.25 866/1651 3.65 3.83 4.18 1 0 0 0 0 3 9 4.75 958/1673 4.92 4.65 4.69	1 11 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1585 3.86 3.79 3.96 3.91 1 4 0 0 2 2 4 4.25 866/1651 3.65 3.83 4.18 4.20 1 0 0 0 0 3 9 4.75 958/1673 4.92 4.65 4.69 4.67 1 0 0 1 1 3 7 4.33 615/1656 4.43 4.00 4.07 4.10

1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	266/1586	4.64	4.29	4.43	4.48	4.88
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.76	5.00
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	217/1582	4.57	4.27	4.26	4.35	4.83
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	246/1575	4.70	4.23	4.27	4.39	4.83

5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 3 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1380 4.60 4.34 3.94 4.03 \*\*\*\*

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	338/1520	4.44	4.17	4.01	4.03	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	543/1515	4.51	4.52	4.24	4.28	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	358/1511	4.63	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.80

Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	265	****	****	4.23	4.34	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	278	****	2.75	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	260	****	****	4.46	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	259	****	****	4.33	4.42	****

12 0

Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	76	****	2.75	3.98	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	77	****	****	3.93	4.20	****

0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 233 \*\*\*\* 4.20 4.48 \*\*\*\*

Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00 ****/	61	****	5.00	4.09	4.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	50	****	5.00	4.44	4.42	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	35	****	4.00	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	31	****	****	4.34	4.50	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there a	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	8	_	_		
					_						

Course-Section: ART 215 0101

Title INTRO TO ART & MEDIA

Instructor: DURANT, MARK

Enrollment: 113
Questionnaires: 72

Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 89 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

NR	. N	ΙA	Fre	que 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		-	-		Sect Mean
_		_	_											
		-	5	_										4.00
		-	-	-										3.73
			-	-	-									
			_	_	-									4.07 4.31
				•	-									4.15
		-		-	-				- ,					4.15
		_	_	_					. ,					4.21
			-	-	-									
.ess 21		۷	Τ	1	0	19	20	4.14	049/1030	4.14	4.00	4.07	4.10	4.14
6		0	1	1	2	6	56	4.74	517/1586	4.74	4.29	4.43	4.48	4.74
6		0	0	0	3	3	60	4.86	664/1585	4.86	4.76	4.69	4.76	4.86
y 6		0	1	2	3	11	49	4.59	535/1582	4.59	4.27	4.26	4.35	4.59
- 6		0	3	0	8	10	45	4.42	793/1575	4.42	4.23	4.27	4.39	4.42
.ng 8		0	1	0	2	6	55			4.78	4.34	3.94	4.03	4.78
1 01		•	-	2	0	1.5	0.0	2 00	000/1500	2 00	4 15	4 01	4 00	2 00
		-			-									3.82
		-	_	_	-				- ,					4.31
				-	-	_								4.76
21	4	:1	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	****/ 994	****	4.04	3.94	3.98	****
ne 71		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.51	4.41	4.07	****
on 71		0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.69	4.48	4.45	****
. 71		^	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ <b>7</b> 6		0 75	2 00	2 07	****
l 71		U	0	U	0	Τ	0	4.00	****/ 7/6	****	2.75	3.98	3.97	****
ed 71		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	4.23	****
71		0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	****	5.00		4.42	****
requenc	y D	ıstı	ribu	tio	n									
ides				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	5
		Reco	 uire	 ام ج	 or M	 aior		1	Gradua+	e	0	Ma i	 or	0
	•		~C	~	OI M	۱۰۲ د	~	_	Gradac		-	1100		J
		Gene	eral					2	Under-a	rad 7	12	Non-	-maior	21
								_	011001 9		_	1.011		
		E104	ctiv					1	11 11 11 11	Means t	horo :	ra not	onouc	rh.
		DTC.		'es				1	#### -	means i			. EIIO11G	
		ETC(	CCIV	es				1					_	,
		Othe		res				0	respons				_	<b>,</b>
	6 6 6 6 8 ned 6 7 7 ess 21 6 6 9 6 9 6 6 9 8 8 d 21 e 21 on 22 21 e 71 on 71 d 71 requence	6 6 6 5 6 8 1 ned 6 7 7 ess 21 6 6 6 9 6 6 ng 8 d 21 e 21 on 22 21 4 e 71 on 71 71 d 71 requency D des	6 0 6 54 6 9 d 8 10 ned 6 4 7 2 7 2 ess 21 2 d 6 0 6 0 0 6 0 0 6 0 0 6 0 0 6 0 0 6 0 0 0 2 1 41 es 71 0 0 d 71 0 equency Districted es Requirements of the control of	NR NA 1	NR NA 1 2  6 0 5 4 6 0 5 5 6 54 0 0 6 9 1 4 8 10 3 0 10 6 4 2 4 7 2 2 3 7 2 0 0 10 2 1 1 6 0 0 0 0 1 1 6 0 0 1 2 6 0 3 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0	NR NA 1 2 3	6 0 5 4 10 14 6 0 5 5 13 23 6 54 0 0 0 4 6 9 1 4 9 19 d 8 10 3 0 4 17 ned 6 4 2 4 8 17 7 2 2 3 11 11 7 2 0 0 0 0 1 ess 21 2 1 1 8 19  6 0 1 1 2 3 11 6 0 3 0 8 10 ng 8 0 1 0 2 6  d 21 0 5 3 8 15 e 21 0 2 2 5 11 on 22 0 2 0 0 4 21 41 1 0 0 3  e 71 0 0 0 0 1 d 71 0 0 0 0 1  d 71 0 0 0 0 1  d 71 0 0 0 0 1  requency Distribution  des Reasons  Required for Major  General	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5  6 0 5 4 10 14 33 6 0 5 5 13 23 20 6 54 0 0 0 4 8 6 9 1 4 9 19 24 d 8 10 3 0 4 17 30 ned 6 4 2 4 8 17 31 7 2 2 3 11 11 36 7 2 0 0 0 1 62 ess 21 2 1 1 8 19 20  6 0 1 1 2 6 56 6 0 0 0 3 3 3 60 y 6 0 1 2 3 11 49 6 0 3 0 8 10 45 ng 8 0 1 0 2 6 55  d 21 0 5 3 8 15 20 e 21 0 2 2 5 11 31 on 22 0 2 0 0 4 44 21 41 1 0 0 3 6  e 71 0 0 0 0 1 0 71 0 0 0 0 1 0  71 0 0 0 0 1 0  requency Distribution  des Reasons  Required for Majors  General	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean  6 0 5 4 10 14 33 4.00 6 0 5 5 13 23 20 3.73 6 54 0 0 0 4 8 4.67 6 9 1 4 9 19 24 4.07 d 8 10 3 0 4 17 30 4.31 ned 6 4 2 4 8 17 31 4.15 7 2 2 3 11 11 36 4.21 7 2 0 0 0 1 62 4.98 ess 21 2 1 1 8 19 20 4.14  6 0 1 1 2 3 11 49 4.59 6 0 3 0 8 10 45 4.42 ng 8 0 1 0 2 6 55 4.78  d 21 0 5 3 8 15 20 3.82 e 21 0 2 2 5 11 31 4.31 on 22 0 2 0 0 4 44 4.76 21 41 1 0 0 3 6 4.30  e 71 0 0 0 0 1 0 3.00  e 71 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00  d 71 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00  requency Distribution  des Reasons  Required for Majors 1  General 2	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank  6 0 5 4 10 14 33 4.00 1196/1674 6 0 5 5 13 23 20 3.73 1388/1674 6 54 0 0 0 4 8 4.67 ****/1423 6 9 1 4 9 19 24 4.07 1048/1609 d 8 10 3 0 4 17 30 4.31 502/1585 7 2 2 3 11 11 36 4.21 924/1651 7 2 0 0 0 1 62 4.98 142/1673 ess 21 2 1 1 8 19 20 4.14 849/1656  6 0 1 1 2 6 56 4.74 517/1586 6 0 0 0 3 3 60 4.86 664/1585 y 6 0 1 2 3 11 49 4.59 535/1582 6 0 3 0 8 10 45 4.42 793/1575 ng 8 0 1 0 2 6 55 4.78 125/1380  d 21 0 5 3 8 15 20 3.82 973/1520 e 21 0 2 2 5 11 31 4.31 847/1515 on 22 0 2 0 0 4 44 4.76 402/1511 21 41 1 0 0 3 6 4.30 ****/ 994  e 71 0 0 0 0 1 0 5.00 ****/ 101  71 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 61 71 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 61 71 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 50  requency Distribution  des Reasons Ty  Required for Majors 1 Graduat  General 2 Under-9	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean  6 0 5 4 10 14 33 4.00 1196/1674 4.00 6 0 5 5 13 23 20 3.73 1388/1674 3.73 6 54 0 0 0 4 8 4.67 ****/1423 **** 6 9 1 4 9 19 24 4.07 1048/1609 4.07 d 8 10 3 0 4 17 30 4.31 502/1585 4.31 ned 6 4 2 4 8 17 31 4.15 787/1535 4.15 7 2 2 3 11 11 36 4.21 924/1651 4.21 7 2 0 0 0 0 1 62 4.98 142/1673 4.98 ess 21 2 1 1 8 19 20 4.14 849/1656 4.14  6 0 1 1 2 6 56 4.74 517/1586 4.74 6 0 0 0 3 3 60 4.86 664/1585 4.86 y 6 0 1 2 3 11 49 4.59 535/1582 4.59 6 0 3 0 8 10 45 4.42 793/1575 4.42 ng 8 0 1 0 2 6 55 4.78 125/1380 4.78  d 21 0 5 3 8 15 20 3.82 973/1520 3.82 e 21 0 2 2 5 11 31 4.31 847/1515 4.31 on 22 0 2 0 0 4 44 4.76 402/1511 4.76 21 41 1 0 0 3 6 4.30 ****/ 994 ****  e 71 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 5.00 ****/ 103 **** on 71 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 994 ****  d 71 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 50 ****  requency Distribution  des Reasons Type  Required for Majors 1 Graduate  General 2 Under-grad 7	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean  6 0 5 4 10 14 33 4.00 1196/1674 4.00 4.32 6 54 0 0 0 4 8 4.67 ****/1423 **** 4.27 6 9 1 4 9 19 24 4.07 1048/1609 4.07 4.34 d 8 10 3 0 4 17 30 4.31 502/1585 4.31 3.79 ned 6 4 2 4 8 17 31 4.15 787/1535 4.15 3.68 7 2 2 3 11 11 36 4.21 924/1651 4.21 3.83 7 2 0 0 0 1 62 4.98 142/1673 4.98 4.65 ess 21 2 1 1 8 19 20 4.14 849/1656 4.14 4.00  6 0 1 1 2 6 56 4.74 517/1586 4.74 4.29 6 0 0 0 3 3 60 4.86 664/1585 4.86 4.76 y 6 0 1 2 3 11 49 4.59 535/1582 4.59 4.27 6 0 3 0 8 10 45 4.42 793/1575 4.42 4.23 ng 8 0 1 0 2 6 55 4.78 125/1380 4.78 4.34  d 21 0 5 3 8 15 20 3.82 973/1520 3.82 4.17 e 21 0 2 2 5 11 31 4.31 847/1515 4.31 4.52 on 22 0 2 0 0 4 44 4.76 402/1511 4.76 4.53 21 41 1 0 0 3 6 4.30 ****/ 994 **** 4.04  e 71 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 994 **** 4.04  e 71 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 994 **** 4.69  The requency Distribution  des Reasons Type  Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0  General 2 Under-grad 72	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean  6 0 5 4 10 14 33 4.00 1196/1674 4.00 4.32 4.27 6 0 5 5 13 23 20 3.73 1388/1674 3.73 4.23 4.23 6 54 0 0 0 4 8 4.67 ****/1423 **** 4.27 4.27 6 9 1 4 9 19 24 4.07 1048/1609 4.07 4.34 4.22 d 8 10 3 0 4 17 30 4.31 502/1585 4.31 3.79 3.96 ned 6 4 2 4 8 17 31 4.15 787/1535 4.15 3.68 4.08 7 2 2 3 11 11 36 4.21 924/1651 4.21 3.83 4.18 7 2 0 0 0 1 62 4.98 142/1673 4.98 4.65 4.69 ess 21 2 1 1 8 19 20 4.14 849/1656 4.14 4.00 4.07  6 0 1 1 2 6 56 4.74 517/1586 4.74 4.29 4.43 6 0 0 0 3 3 3 60 4.86 664/1585 4.86 4.76 4.69 y 6 0 1 2 3 11 49 4.59 535/1582 4.59 4.27 4.26 6 0 3 0 8 10 45 4.42 793/1575 4.42 4.23 4.27 ng 8 0 1 0 2 6 55 4.78 125/1380 4.78 4.34 3.94  d 21 0 5 3 8 15 20 3.82 973/1520 3.82 4.17 4.01 e 21 0 2 2 5 11 31 4.31 847/1515 4.31 4.52 4.24 on 22 0 2 0 0 4 44 4.76 402/1511 4.76 4.53 d 21 0 1 0 2 6 55 4.78 125/1380 4.78 4.34 3.94  e 71 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean

Course-Section: ART 220 0101 Title ART HISTORY I

Instructor: FELDMAN, JOAN

Enrollment: 120
Questionnaires: 74

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 90 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				_	ncie		-		tructor	Course	_			Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	6	22	44	4.43	719/1674	4.43	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	15	52	4.58	495/1674	4.58	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	11	61	4.79	214/1423	4.79	4.27	4.27	4.36	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	2	1	7	22	32	4.27	839/1609	4.27	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	1	12	16	38	4.26	548/1585	4.26	3.79	3.96	3.91	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	5	5	13	23	25	3.82	1101/1535	3.82	3.68	4.08	4.03	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	13	53	4.59	419/1651	4.59	3.83	4.18	4.20	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	3	69	4.90	706/1673	4.90	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	2	0	1	7	27	19	4.19	805/1656	4.19	4.00	4.07	4.10	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	18	55	4.73	560/1586	4.73	4.29	4.43	4.48	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	71	4.96	284/1585	4.96	4.76	4.69	4.76	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	15	54	4.68	409/1582	4.68	4.27	4.26	4.35	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	65	4.82	257/1575	4.82	4.23	4.27	4.39	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	9	61	4.87	89/1380	4.87	4.34	3.94	4.03	4.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	6	0	14	16	20	3.79	1002/1520	3.79	4.17	4.01	4.03	3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	3	4	12	13	24	3.91	1125/1515	3.91	4.52	4.24	4.28	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	3	1	8	18	28	4.16	983/1511	4.16	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.16
4. Were special techniques successful	16	40	4	3	3	2	6	3.17	****/ 994	****	4.04	3.94	3.98	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	63	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.34	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	68	0	4	0	0	0	2	2.33	****/ 278	****	2.75	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	66	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.51	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	67	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.51	4.41	4.07	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	68	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 101	****	4.69	4.48	4.45	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	68	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	68	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 99	****	4.33	4.39	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	68	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.27	4.14	4.63	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	70	0	3	0	0	1	0	1.75	****/ 76	****	2.75	3.98	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	70	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	4.20	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	70	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	70	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	71	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	4.23	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	71	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.26	4.53	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	71	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	4.42	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	71	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	71	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.50	****

Course-Section: ART 220 0101
Title ART HISTORY I
Instructor: FELDMAN, JOAN
Enrollment: 120

Questionnaires: 74

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 90 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Ā	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	4	 А	39	Required for Majors	26	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	В	27						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	7	C	3	General	9	Under-grad	74	Non-major	16
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	34	_			
				?	0						

Baltimore County

Course-Section: ART 221 0101

107

ART HISTORY II

OTTESEN, BODIL

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 100

University of Maryland Page 91 JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

-																		
					Fr	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera					_											
_	-	w insights,ski			39	0	1	4	13	24	19		1309/1674		4.32	4.27	4.32	3.92
		tor make clear			39	0	3	13 10	17 13	20	8		1572/1674		4.23	4.23	4.26	3.28
	_	estions reflec			39 39	5	3	9	14	16 17	19 13		1237/1423 1452/1609		4.27	4.27	4.36	3.62 3.50
		ations reflect		what you learned	39	2	3	4	5	21	26	4.07			3.79	3.96	3.91	4.07
				o what you learned	39	2	<i>5</i>	5	16	21	12		1295/1535		3.79	4.08	4.03	3.51
		signments conti s system clearl			39	0	8	8	12	19	14		1493/1651		3.83	4.18	4.20	3.38
		was class cand		IIIca	40	0	0	0	4	27	29		1300/1673		4.65	4.69	4.67	4.42
	-			hing effectiveness	50	1	3	6	20	19	1		1500/1656			4.07	4.10	3.18
				-														
		Lectur																
		ctor's lecture			41	0	1	2	8	15	33		1104/1586		4.29	4.43	4.48	4.31
		tor seem inter			41	0	0	0	0	17	42		1002/1585		4.76	4.69	4.76	4.71
				xplained clearly	42	0	1	8	13	20	16		1320/1582		4.27	4.26	4.35	3.72
		s contribute t			42	0	2	4	12	14	26		1138/1575		4.23	4.27	4.39	4.00
5. Did au	diovisual	. techniques en	hance y	our understanding	41	3	1	5	7	12	31	4.20	540/1380	4.20	4.34	3.94	4.03	4.20
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu			what you learned	58	0	20	4	9	4	5	2.29	1493/1520	2.29	4.17	4.01	4.03	2.29
				d to participate	58	0	24	9	4	4	1		1503/1515		4.52	4.24	4.28	1.79
		d open discussion	60	0	16	4	9	6	5		1476/1511		4.53	4.27	4.28	2.50		
4. Were s	pecial te	-	56	38	1	2	2	1	0	2.50	****/ 994	***	4.04	3.94	3.98	****		
		Semina						_	_									****
				ividual attention	99	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 101		4.69	4.48	4.45	
				what you learned	98	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 95		4.50	4.31	4.33	****
		ons contribute			99	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 99 ****/ 97		4.33	4.39	4.22	****
5. Were c	riteria I	or grading mad	le clear		99	0	1	U	Ü	0	U	1.00	****/ 97	***	4.27	4.14	4.63	****
		Field	Work															
1. Did fi	eld exper			hat you learned	99	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	2.75	3.98	3.97	****
	_			uation criteria	99	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 77	****	****	3.93	4.20	****
_	_	could you disc			98	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 48	***	****	4.12	4.50	****
	-	-	-															
		Self																
				what you learned	98	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 61		5.00	4.09	4.23	****
		k/tutoring by	_	_	98	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 35		4.00	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were t	here enou	igh proctors fo	or all t	he students	99	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.50	****
				Frequ	ency	n Dis	trib	utio	n									
			1															
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Re	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	3		
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	3	A 16		Re	 quir	ed f	or M	aior	s 1	.5	 Graduat	 е	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B 28			-1 ~ -1			(		-	or adda c	-	-			ŭ
56-83	56-83 7 2.00-2.99 3 C 8							1				5	Under-g	rad 10	0	Non-	-major	76
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	12	D 0									3				-	
Grad.	0	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh		
				P 1									respons					
				I 0		Ot	her				3	3						
				? 1														

? 1

#### Course-Section: ART 275 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO PRINTMAKING Baltimore County Fall 2005

Instructor: JEON, DIANA N

Enrollment: 10

Questionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 92

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	298/1674	4.75	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.7
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.5
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.36	* * *
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	852/1609	4.25	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.2
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	1	3	1	3.13	1415/1585	3.13	3.79	3.96	3.91	3.1
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	4	2	0	3.14	1419/1535	3.14	3.68	4.08	4.03	3.1
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	3.83	4.18	4.20	4.0
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.0
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1200/1656	3.80	4.00	4.07	4.10	3.8
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1300/1586	4.00	4.29	4.43	4.48	4.0
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	737/1585	4.83	4.76	4.69	4.76	4.8
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	998/1582	4.20	4.27	4.26	4.35	4.2
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	819/1575	4.40	4.23	4.27	4.39	4.4
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	666/1380	4.00	4.34	3.94	4.03	4.0
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.17	4.01	4.03	4.0
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	759/1515	4.40	4.52	4.24	4.28	4.4
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	751/1511	4.40	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.4
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5		Red	 quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title DRAWING II Instructor: McConville, Mat Fall 2005

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 13

Course-Section: ART 314 0101

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 93

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Tnst	tructor	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	1	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	751/1674		4.32	4.27	4.26	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	5	5		1026/1674		4.23	4.23	4.21	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	0	3		****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.27	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	312/1609	4.67	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	0	0	2		****/1585	****	3.79	3.96	3.95	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	0	0	1		****/1535	****	3.68	4.08	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	3	3	1			1426/1651		3.83	4.18	4.16	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1			635/1673		4.65	4.69	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	871/1656	4.13	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	1034/1586	4.38	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	557/1582		4.27	4.26	4.26	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50			4.23	4.27	4.25	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	0	0	1	1		4.25	489/1380				4.01	
									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	145/1520		4.17	4.01	4.09	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1515		4.52	4.24	4.32	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	266/1511	4.89	4.53	4.27	4.34	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 994	****	4.04	3.94	3.96	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	2.75	4.19	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.33	****
Seminar		_				_	_							****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 103	***	4.51	4.41	4.10	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.69	4.48	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.33	4.39	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.27	4.14	3.48	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.75	3.98	4.03	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		****	****	4.27	3.27	****
Self Paced	10	^	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ (1	****	E 00	4 00	2 00	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	-		0	0	1		****/ 61 ****/ 52	****	5.00	4.09	3.20	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, -	****	4.00	4.26	3.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	3.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35		4.00	4.36	3.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	U	U	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	^ ~ ~ ~	^ ^ * *	4.34	4.29	* * * *

Course-Section: ART 314 0101
Title DRAWING II

Instructor: McConville, Mat

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 93 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0 M	lajor	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	7	Under-grad 1	.3 N	Ion-major	3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means t	here are	not enough	
				P	0			responses to b	e signifi	cant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

I

?

0

0

Course-Section: ART 315 0101

VIDEO I

14

GRABILL, VIN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 14

Page 94 JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

9

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire	2

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	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 vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	2	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1309/1674	3.92	4.32	4.27	4.26	3.92
_	-	ctor make clear			2	0	0	0	2	6	4		1026/1674		4.23	4.23	4.21	4.17
		uestions reflec			2	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	968/1423	4.08	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.08
	_	uations reflect		_	2	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	629/1609	4.42	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.42
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	3	2	3	3	3.55	1199/1585	3.55	3.79	3.96	3.95	3.55
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	3	7	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	1492/1535	2.75	3.68	4.08	4.15	2.75
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	3	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1228/1651	3.91	3.83	4.18	4.16	3.91
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		3	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1103/1673	4.64	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.64
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	1124/1656	3.91	4.00	4.07	4.07	3.91
		Lectur	۵															
1 Were t	he instri			nrenared	2	0	0	0	2	6	4	4 17	1211/1586	4.17	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.17
	re the instructor's lectures well prepared d the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	4	8		1071/1585		4.76	4.69	4.66	4.67
						0	0	0	2	6	4		1025/1582		4.27	4.26	4.26	4.17
	as lecture material presented and explained clear d the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	1	1	5	5		1040/1575		4.23	4.27	4.25	4.17
				our understanding	2	0	0	0	0	2	10		103/1380		4.34	3.94		4.83
J. Dia aa	alovibaa	r ccciniiques en	nance y	our unacrocanaring	-	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	-	10	1.03	103/1300	1.05	1.51	3.71	1.01	1.03
		Discus					_		_	_								
				what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	546/1520		4.17	4.01	4.09	4.36
		-	_	d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	207/1515		4.52	4.24	4.32	4.91
		_		d open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	0	9	4.55	610/1511		4.53	4.27	4.34	4.55
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	sstul		3	7	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	4.04	3.94	3.96	4.00
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27							quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55																		
56-83							nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	

Other

Course-Section: ART 323 0101

20TH CENTURY ART

Title Instructor: SMALLS, JAMES

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 40

Page 95 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2005

			Fre	eane	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	0	1	6	6	22	4.40	768/1674	4.44	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	2	1	6	10	16	4.06	1111/1674	4.31	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	1	2	8	10	14	3.97	1043/1423	4.29	4.27	4.27	4.27	3.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	3	0	2	9	13	7	3.81	1285/1609	4.00	4.34	4.22	4.27	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	5	4	7	7	11	3.44	1267/1585	3.44	3.79	3.96	3.95	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	1	4	5	11	9	4	3.12	1423/1535	3.56	3.68	4.08	4.15	3.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	4	6	10	13		1240/1651	4.27	3.83	4.18	4.16	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	0	0	3	30	4.91	706/1673	4.95	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	5	19	6	4.03	936/1656	4.31	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	4	29	4.82	354/1586	4.90	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	3	31	4.91	510/1585	4.96	4.76	4.69	4.66	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	5		19	4.41		4.59	4.27	4.26	4.26	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	6	26	4.68	. ,		4.23	4.27	4.25	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	1	3	7			318/1380		4.34			4.48
J. Did additionable reciminates children your understanding	,	2	U	_	J	,	20	1.10	310/1300	1.35	1.51	3.71	1.01	1.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	3	3	2	6	5	3.37	1239/1520	3.64	4.17	4.01	4.09	3.37
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	2	1	3	4	9		1141/1515	4.36	4.52	4.24	4.32	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	2	2	3	4	8		1232/1511	4.29	4.53	4.27	4.34	3.74
4. Were special techniques successful	22	13	0	3	0	0			****/ 994				3.96	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	2.75	4.19	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.33	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.18	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.51	4.41	4.10	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.69	4.48	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.33	4.39	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.27	4.14	3.48	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	2.75	3.98	4.03	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****
									,					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	3.20	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.26	3.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	3.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.29	****

Course-Section: ART 323 0101 Title 20TH CENTURY ART Instructor:

SMALLS, JAMES

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 40 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 95 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	17						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	40	Non-major	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ART 323 0102 University of Maryland Title 20TH CENTURY ART Baltimore County

Instructor: JACOB, PREMINDA Fall 2005

Enrollment: 44

Questionnaires: 44

Page 96 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1														
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	9	0	0	1	2	11	21	4.49	639/1674	1 11	1 22	4.27	4.26	4.49
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	0	1	1	10	23	4.49	495/1674	4.44	4.32	4.27	4.20	4.49
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	2	1	6	26	4.60	459/1423	4.29	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	0	1	2	4	10	18	4.20	930/1609	4.00	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	1	6	3	6	8	11		1267/1585	3.44	3.79	3.96	3.95	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	3	7	12	13	4.00	870/1535	3.56	3.68	4.08	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	0	0	3	6	26	4.66	340/1651	4.27	3.83	4.18	4.16	4.66
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	0	35	5.00	1/1673	4.95	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	0	0	2	7	18	4.59	317/1656	4.31	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	1	34	4.97	64/1586		4.29	4.43	4.42	4.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	35	5.00	1/1585	4.96	4.76	4.69	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	6	28	4.77	286/1582	4.59	4.27	4.26	4.26	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	3	30	4.80	279/1575	4.74	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	1	0	2	2	29	4.71	173/1380	4.59	4.34	3.94	4.01	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	1	7	5	10	3.92	912/1520	3.64	4.17	4.01	4.09	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	289/1515	4.36	4.52	4.24	4.32	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	323/1511	4.29	4.53	4.27	4.34	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	20	10	2	0	3	2	7	3.86	591/ 994	3.86	4.04	3.94	3.96	3.86
Laboratory					_		_							
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 278	****	2.75	4.19	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43 43	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 259 ****/ 233	****	****	4.33	4.33	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	^^^^/ 233	***		4.20	4.18	* * * *
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.69	4.48	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.33	4.39	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.27	4.14	3.48	****
nt of a words														
Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 76	****	0.75	2 00	4 02	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42 42	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 76 ****/ 77	***	2.75	3.98 3.93	4.03 3.70	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	42	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.70	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 49	****	****	4.12	3.07	****
J. Did conferences help you carry out fred activities	13	U	U	U	U	U		3.00	/ 40			1.2/	3.27	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	3.20	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.26	3.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	3.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.29	****

Course-Section: ART 323 0102
Title 20TH CENTURY ART
Instructor: JACOB, PREMINDA

Enrollment: 44
Questionnaires: 44

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 96 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	20	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0 Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	12					
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	2	Under-grad 4	Non-major	12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	D	0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means t	there are not enoug	jh
				P	0			responses to b	oe significant	
				I	0	Other	27			
				?	0					

Course-Section: ART 324 0101

HISTORY OF FILM TO 196

Title Instructor: WORDEN, FRED

Enrollment: 64

Questionnaires: 62

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 97 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eane	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	18	0	0	0	10	14	20	4.23	991/1674	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	18	0	0	1	6	17	20	4.27	906/1674	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	18	0	1	0	5	15	23	4.34	760/1423	4.34	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.34
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	18	25	0	0	6	5	8		1029/1609	4.11	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	2	10	14	17	4.07	728/1585	4.07	3.79	3.96	3.95	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	21	29	0	0	6	0	6		****/1535	****	3.68	4.08	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	19	0	0	1	3	11	28	4.53	484/1651	4.53	3.83	4.18	4.16	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	20	0	0	0	1	2	39	4.90	706/1673	4.90	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	2	0	0	4	24	7	4.09	906/1656	4.09	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	1	3	9	27	4.55	805/1586	4.55	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	0	0	2	5	33	4.78	874/1585	4.78	4.76	4.69	4.66	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	0	2	3	14	21	4.35	829/1582	4.35	4.27	4.26		4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	4	13	22	4.38	847/1575	4.38	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	0	0	0	2	6	31	4.74	149/1380	4.74	4.34	3.94	4.01	4.74
or bid dudiovibual occumiques cimanoc four undersounding		ŭ	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	31		115, 1500		1.51	3.71	1.01	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	32	0	4	2	8	10	6		1221/1520	3.40	4.17	4.01	4.09	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	32	0	0	3	7	4	16	4.10	993/1515	4.10	4.52	4.24	4.32	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	32	0	0	0	3	7	20	4.57	594/1511	4.57	4.53	4.27	4.34	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	32	24	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	****/ 994	****	4.04	3.94	3.96	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	61	0	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	61	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	2.75	4.19	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	61	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	61	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.33	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	61	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.18	***
Seminar					_									
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	61	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 103	****	4.51	4.41	4.10	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	61	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.69	4.48	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	61	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	61	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	4.33	4.39	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	61	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.27	4.14	3.48	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	61	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	2.75	3.98	4.03	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	61	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	61	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	61	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	61	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****
Self Paced	<i>c</i> 1	0	•	•	-	•	0	2 02		ate ate ate at	F 00	4 00	2 00	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	61	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	***	5.00	4.09	3.20	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	61	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.26	3.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	61	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	3.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	61 61	0	0	0	1 1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35 ****/ 31	****	4.00	4.36	3.29 4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	рΤ	U	U	U	Τ	U	U	3.00	/ 31			4.34	4.29	

Course-Section: ART 324 0101

Title HISTORY OF FILM TO 196

Instructor: WORDEN, FRED

Enrollment: 64
Questionnaires: 62

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 97 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	10	General	16	Under-grad	62	Non-major	31
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 326 0101 University of Maryland HIST. OF PHOTOGRAPHY I Baltimore County

Title Instructor: STEPHANY, JAROM

Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 36

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 98 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	17	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	582/1674	4.53	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	16	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	737/1674	4.40	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	16	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	648/1423	4.45	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	16	4	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	598/1609	4.44	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	1	2	6	10	4.15	652/1585	4.15	3.79	3.96	3.95	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	3	9	7	4.21	715/1535	4.21	3.68	4.08	4.15	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	16	0	0	1	3	3	13	4.40	673/1651	4.40	3.83	4.18	4.16	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	16	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	719/1656	4.25	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	618/1586	4.70	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	567/1585	4.90	4.76	4.69	4.66	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	525/1582	4.60	4.27	4.26	4.26	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	359/1575	4.75	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	0	0	1	2	1	14	4.56	272/1380	4.56	4.34	3.94	4.01	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	4	0	5	3.80	986/1520	3.80	4.17	4.01	4.09	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	1	2	0	3	5		1175/1515		4.52	4.24	4.32	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	1	0	2	1	6		1018/1511	4.10	4.53	4.27	4.34	
4. Were special techniques successful	26	7	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 994		4.04	3.94		****
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Gradita Formed Grades	- 1								т.				Mojewa	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	 6	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	36	Non-major	20
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ART 331 0101
Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I

Instructor: Kozak, Jennifer

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 99 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor

							Fre	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Cours	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
. Did vo	nı gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	243/1674	4.67	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.80
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	168/1674		4.23	4.23	4.21	4.87
		uations reflect		_	1	2	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	97/1609			4.22	4.27	4.92
				what you learned	2	13	0	0	0	0	1		****/1585			3.96	3.95	***
		g system clearl			2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	197/1651		3.79	4.18		4.7
				ainea			0	0	0	0	14		. ,				4.16	
	-	was class cand		1.1 66	2	0	-	-	-	-		5.00	1/1673		4.65	4.69	4.68	5.0
. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	.ii tea	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	274/1656	4.57	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.6
		Lectur	e															
. Were t	he instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	301/1586	4.92	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.8
. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested :	in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1585	4.85	4.76	4.69	4.66	5.0
				explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	199/1582	2 4.74	4.27	4.26	4.26	4.8
		es contribute t			2	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	311/1575			4.27	4.25	4.7
				your understanding	3	1	0	0	4	2	6	4.17					4.01	
. Dia au	laiovisua.	r cecimiques en	mance .	your understanding	5	_	U	U	T	4	O	1.1/	307/1300	7.20	1.51	3.94	4.01	7.1
		Discus			_	_	_	_		_			004	= -				
				what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	221/1520		4.17	4.01		4.7
				ed to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	165/1515	4.89	4.52	4.24	4.32	4.9
B. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	195/1511	4.60	4.53	4.27	4.34	4.9
. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		3	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	174/ 994	4.53	4.04	3.94	3.96	4.5
		Labora	torv															
l. Did th	e lab ind	crease understa	ndina (	of the material	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.26	***
			_	kground information	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278		2.75	4.19	4.24	***
				for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 260		****	4.46	4.49	***
. Were ii	iccepbar y	maccitais avai	idbic .	tor lab accivities	13	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	, 200	,		1.10	1.15	
		Semina									_							***:
				e announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 103		4.51	4.41	4.10	
				dividual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 101	=	4.69	4.48	4.30	***
ł. Did pr	esentatio	ons contribute	to wha	t you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.33	4.39	4.29	***
. Were c	riteria 1	for grading mad	e clea	r	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	7 ****	4.27	4.14	3.48	***
		Self	Paced															
L. Did se	lf-paced	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6]	****	5.00	4.09	3.20	***
		acts with the i			15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 50		5.00		3.82	***
. Were y	our conce	aceb with the i	iib ci ac	cor neipiui	13	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	O	_	3.00	, 30	,	3.00	1.11	3.02	
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	⁄pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 14			 quir					0	 Graduat		 0	Majo		0
						кес	quir	eu L	OT Mg	JUL	B	U	Gradual	-	U	Ma JC	JΤ	U
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		~		,				0	TT 3		1.6			_
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	T				0	Under-9	grad	16	Non-	-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	ſh
				P 0									respons	ses to :	be sign	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Otl	her				1	.2						
				2 0														

Course-Section: ART 331 0201 University of Maryland Page 100
Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: Kozak, Jennifer Fall 2005
Enrollment: 14

Ο	uestionnaires:	13	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1674	4.67	4.32	4.27	4.26	5.00
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	124/1674	4.76	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.92
		uestions reflec			1	7	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1423	4.75	4.27	4.27	4.27	5.00
4. Did ot	her evalı	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	109/1609	4.75	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.92
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to i	what you learned	1	7	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	265/1585	4.68	3.79	3.96	3.95	4.60
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	1	8	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	169/1535	4.75	3.68	4.08	4.15	4.75
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla:	ined	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	104/1651	4.77	3.83	4.18	4.16	4.92
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	4.87	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	230/1656	4.57	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.70
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	actor's lecture	s well 1	orepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1586	4.92	4.29	4.43	4.42	5.00
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1585	4.85	4.76	4.69	4.66	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	136/1582	4.74	4.27	4.26	4.26	4.92
		es contribute t			1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	154/1575	4.72	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.92
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	4	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	227/1380	4.26	4.34	3.94	4.01	4.63
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	134/1520	4.73	4.17	4.01	4.09	4.91
2. Were a	.ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1515	4.89	4.52	4.24	4.32	5.00
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair and	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1511	4.60	4.53	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		3	3	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	86/ 994	4.53	4.04	3.94	3.96	4.86
				Frequ	ency	, Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re:	asons	2			Ту	ne			Majors	
										, 								, 
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 3		~		,				-	1		2			0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nera	Т				1	Under-g	rad I	.3	Non-	-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		п.						2		Maa +	. la			-la
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						EIT	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				2	#### - 1				_	111
				P 0 I 0		0-1						0	respons	es lo D	e sign	iiican	IL	
				T 0		Utl	ner					8						

Course-Section: ART 331 0301 University of Maryland
Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I Baltimore County
That region: Type JEANNE C. Fall 2005

84-150

Grad.

1

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

4

2

D

F

Р

I

?

0

0

0

0

0

Instructor: IVY, JEANNE C. Fall 2005
Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 15 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fr	equei	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	.1															
1 Di	id vou cai	n new insights,ski.		m this course	5	0	Ο	2	1	0	7	4 20	1026/1674	4.67	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.20
		structor make clear			5	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	578/1674		4.23	4.23	4.21	4.50
		m questions reflec		_	5	6	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	575/1423		4.27	4.27	4.27	4.50
		evaluations reflect		_	5	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	645/1609	4.75	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.40
		ed readings contrib		1 5	5	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	167/1585		3.79	3.96	3.95	4.75
				o what you learned	5	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	169/1535		3.68	4.08	4.15	4.75
		ding system clearl		_	5	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	393/1651	4.77	3.83	4.18	4.16	4.60
8. Ho	ow many ti	mes was class cand	elled		5	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1135/1673	4.87	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.60
9. Ho	ow would y	ou grade the overa	all teac	hing effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	561/1656	4.57	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.38
		Lectur																
1 W.	oro tho ir	nstructor's lecture		propared	6	0	0	0	Λ	1	0	4.89	249/1586	4.92	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.89
		structor seem inter			6	0	0	1	0	1	7		1183/1585	4.85	4.76	4.69	4.66	4.56
		e material presente		_	6	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	719/1582		4.27	4.26	4.26	4.44
		tures contribute t			6	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	768/1575		4.23	4.27	4.25	4.44
		sual techniques en		-	6	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	666/1380		4.34	3.94	4.01	
1 -		Discus			_	0	_	0	-	_	_	4 50	205/1500	4 50	4 1 5	4 01	4 00	4 50
		liscussions contrib			/	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	397/1520		4.17	4.01	4.09	4.50
		udents actively en structor encourage			7 7	0	0	0 1	1	0	1	4.75	384/1515 1155/1511	4.89 4.60	4.52 4.53	4.24 4.27	4.32	4.75 3.88
		structor encourage al techniques succe		d open discussion	7	1	0	1	0	3	3		420/ 994		4.53	3.94	3.96	
4. We	ere specia	ii teciiiiques succe	SSLUI		,	1	U	1	U	3	3	4.14	420/ 994	4.53	4.04	3.94	3.90	4.14
		Labora	itory															
1. Di	id the lak	o increase understa	inding c	of the material	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.26	***
				Frequ	ıencv	, Dist	trib	ution	ı									
				-	-													
Credi	its Earned	d Cum. GPA	7	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-2	 27 1	0.00-0.99	0	А 8		Red	 quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	- – – – S	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	0
28-5	55 0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1			-			_						3 -		
56-8	3 3	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	5	Non-	major	8

Electives

Other

0

9

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Page 101

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2005

Page 102 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

I 0

? 0

Course-Section: ART 332 0101

14

GRAPHIC DESIGN II

WITKOWSKI, TRIS

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

							Fre	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	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 y	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	214/1674	4.69	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.83
2. Did t	he instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	446/1674	4.65	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.62
3. Did t	he exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	445/1423	4.54	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.62
4. Did o	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	673/1609	4.31	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.38
5. Did a	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	432/1585	4.01	3.79	3.96	3.95	4.38
6. Did w	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	8	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	737/1535	4.31	3.68	4.08	4.15	4.20
7. Was t	he grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	2	4	0	7	3.92	1201/1651	4.13	3.83	4.18	4.16	3.92
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1246/1673	4.31	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.46
9. How we	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	522/1656	4.50	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.40
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	192/1586	4.88	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.92
2. Did t	he instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	510/1585	4.96	4.76	4.69	4.66	4.92
3. Was l	ecture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	850/1582	4.63	4.27	4.26	4.26	4.33
4. Did t	he lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	692/1575	4.67	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.50
5. Did a	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	303/1380	4.40	4.34	3.94	4.01	4.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	912/1520	4.21	4.17	4.01	4.09	3.92
2. Were	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	1	0	0	2	2	1	7	4.08	999/1515	4.23	4.52	4.24	4.32	4.08
3. Did t	he instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	d open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	740/1511	4.46	4.53	4.27	4.34	4.42
4. Were	special to	echniques succe	ssful		1	6	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	4.04	3.94	3.96	4.00
				Frequ	ency	/ Dist	rib	utio:	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5 B 6		Red	quir	ea i	or Ma	ajor	`S	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	= *		C.		1				0	IIndox	mad 1	2	Morr	ma i a	_
56-83 84-150	2	2.00-2.99	1	0 0		Ger	nera!	Т				U	Under-g	rau I	.3	non-	-major	5
84-150 Grad.	2	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	1 3	D 0 F 0		. הם	ecti					0	инии ,	Moona +	homo -			·h
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	3	P 0		₽T€	:CL1	ves				U	#### - 1				_	111
				P 0							_	_	respons	es to L	e sign	ıııcaı	IL	

Other

11

Course-Section: ART 332 0102

University of Maryland GRAPHIC DESIGN II Baltimore County

Title WITKOWSKI, TRIS Instructor:

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 13 Fall 2005

Page 103 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	570/1674	4.69	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	338/1674	4.65	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	623/1423	4.54	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	879/1609	4.31	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	2	3	4	3.64	1142/1585	4.01	3.79	3.96	3.95	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	481/1535	4.31	3.68	4.08	4.15	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	768/1651	4.13	3.83	4.18	4.16	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	2	4.15	1491/1673	4.31	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	310/1656	4.50	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	336/1586	4.88	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1585	4.96	4.76	4.69	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0			4.92				4.26	4.26	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	246/1575	4.67	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	447/1380	4.40	4.34	3.94	4.01	
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	_	U	U	3	O	4.30	44//1300	4.40	4.34	3.94	4.01	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	397/1520	4.21	4.17	4.01	4.09	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	788/1515	4.23	4.52	4.24	4.32	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	642/1511	4.46	4.53	4.27	4.34	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	4.04	3.94	3.96	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.26	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	2.75	4.19	4.24	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.33	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.18	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 103	****	4.51	4.41	4.10	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.69	4.48	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 99	****	4.33	4.39	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 97	****	4.27	4.14	3.48	****
5. Were effected for grading made effect	12	O	Ü	O	Ü	_	O	1.00	, ,,		1.27	1.11	3.10	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	2.75	3.98	4.03	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	3.20	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.26	3.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	3.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 31	****	****	4.34		****
		-	-		-	_	-		, , , , , , ,					

Course-Section: ART 332 0102

Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II

Instructor: WITKOWSKI, TRIS
Enrollment: 14

Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 103 JAN 21, 2006 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	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 333 0101 University of Maryland Page 104
Title GRAPHIC DESIGN III Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: CAMPBELL, SUSAN Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

TITOCI	uccor	. •	CAME DELLE,	DODAN
Enrol	lment	:	12	
		_		

Questionnaires: 8 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Frequencies					Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1														,	
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	176/1674	4.56	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.88
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	270/1674	4.50	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.75
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1423	4.63	4.27	4.27	4.27	5.00
	_	uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1609	4.71	4.34	4.22	4.27	5.00
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	101/1585	4.40	3.79	3.96	3.95	4.88
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	870/1535	4.00	3.68	4.08	4.15	4.00
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	1009/1651	4.15	3.83	4.18	4.16	4.13
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1332/1673	4.27	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.38
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	794/1656	3.99	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.20
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were t	he instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	266/1586	4.69	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.88
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1585	4.79	4.76	4.69	4.66	5.00
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	496/1582	4.52	4.27	4.26	4.26	4.63
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						1	0	0	2	5	4.25	958/1575	4.13	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.25
5. Did au	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				0	2	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	845/1380	3.22	4.34	3.94	4.01	3.83
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	489/1520	4.12	4.17	4.01	4.09	4.43
				ed to participate	1	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29		4.32	4.52	4.24		4.29
				d open discussion	1	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14		4.16	4.53	4.27		4.14
		echniques succe		-	1	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	591/ 994	3.76	4.04	3.94	3.96	3.86
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				P.e.	asons	2			Ту	ne			Majors	•		
		Cum. GPA	. – – – – –															, 
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Required for M				ajors	5	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3							1							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General					0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	-major	0		
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0								•			,			,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0 P 0		Εle	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### - 1				_	lu
				I 0		O+1	ner					8	respons	es to L	e sign	ıııcaı	16	
				Ι Ο		ULI	TCT					U						

Course-Section: ART 333 0201 University of Maryland Page 105
Title GRAPHIC DESIGN III Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: CAMPBELL, SUSAN Fall 2005
Enrollment: 13

Questionnaires: 13 Student Course Evaluation Questionn	Ouestionnaires:	13	Student C	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnai:	re
--	-----------------	----	-----------	--------	------------	--------------	----

					Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4				_		tructor		e Dept					
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		om this course	1	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	954/1674	4.56	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.25
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	931/1674		4.23	4.23	4.21	4.25
		uestions reflec			1	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	845/1423	4.63	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.25
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	629/1609	4.71	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.42
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrik	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	6	3	3.92	893/1585	4.40	3.79	3.96	3.95	3.92
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	1	5	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	870/1535	4.00	3.68	4.08	4.15	4.00
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	1	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	966/1651	4.15	3.83	4.18	4.16	4.17
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		1	0	0	0	0	10	2	4.17	1484/1673	4.27	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.17
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	7	0	3.78	1222/1656	3.99	4.00	4.07	4.07	3.78
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	858/1586	4.69	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.50
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	1158/1585	4.79	4.76	4.69	4.66	4.58
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	762/1582	4.52	4.27	4.26	4.26	4.42
4. Did th	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						1	0	2	4	5	4.00	1138/1575	4.13	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.00
5. Did au	diovisual techniques enhance your understandir			our understanding	2	6	0	3	1	1	0	2.60	1311/1380	3.22	4.34	3.94	4.01	2.60
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrik	ute to	what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	979/1520	4.12	4.17	4.01	4.09	3.82
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	2	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	798/1515	4.32	4.52	4.24	4.32	4.36
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	2		0	0	3	3	5	4.18	962/1511	4.16	4.53	4.27	4.34	4.18
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	essful		2	5	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	676/ 994	3.76	4.04	3.94	3.96	3.67
				Frequ	ency.	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	L	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10						 ajors		0	 Graduat		0	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2		r.ec	quil	eu I	JT 141	ajurs		U	Graduat	C	U	Ma JC	, <u> </u>	U
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	В 2 С 0	General					0	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	4		
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		Gei	iici a.	_				U	onder -g.	Iuu I		11011	ilia JUI	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		E14	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
craa.	Ü	3.33 1.00	-	P 0								•	respons				_	
	I 0 Other								1	.2	-		3					

Course-Section: ART 334 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title GRAPHIC DESIGN IV

Instructor: BELL, KATHRYN L Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 16

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 106 JAN 21, 2006 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	Mean	Mean
	General														
	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	3	1	1	6	3		1558/1674		4.32	4.27	4.26	3.36
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	2	2	6	3		1465/1674		4.23	4.23	4.21	3.57
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	12	0	0	0	1	1		****/1423		4.27	4.27	4.27	****
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	4	1	1	2	5		1521/1609	3.45	4.34	4.22	4.27	3.23
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	10	0	1	1	1	0		****/1585		3.79	3.96	3.95	****
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	5	3	0	3	1	1		1501/1535		3.68	4.08	4.15	2.63
	Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	4	4	0	3	3		1596/1651		3.83	4.18	4.16	2.79
	How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3			915/1673		4.65	4.69	4.68	4.79
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	3	0	4	2	1	2.80	1592/1656	3.07	4.00	4.07	4.07	2.80
	Lecture														
1	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	4	1	3	3	3	3.00	1539/1586	3.10	4.29	4.43	4.42	3.00
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	2	3	7		1472/1585		4.76	4.69	4.66	4.00
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	3	2	3	4		1467/1582			4.26	4.26	3.29
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	2	3	2	3		1487/1575		4.23	4.27	4.25	3.00
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	2	1	2	1			1298/1380					2.71
	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1														
	Discussion														
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	3	1	6		1169/1520		4.17	4.01	4.09	3.50
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	2	2	2	7		1158/1515	3.93	4.52	4.24	4.32	3.86
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	3	1	3	7		1050/1511		4.53	4.27	4.34	4.00
4	Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	474/ 994	3.42	4.04	3.94	3.96	4.00
	Laboratory														
1	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.26	****
	Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 278	2.75	2.75	4.19	4.24	****
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.33	****
1.	bid the lab institution provide assistance	13	O	O	Ü	_	O	U	3.00	/ 235			1.33	1.33	
	Seminar														
1.	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.51	4.41	4.10	****
2	Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.69	4.48	4.30	****
3.	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****
4	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	3.00	4.33	4.39	4.29	****
5	Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	2.50	4.27	4.14	3.48	****
	Field Work														
1	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	2.75	2.75	3.98	4.03	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****
	Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****
	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 49	****	****	4.12	3.27	****
. د	Did conferences help you carry out fretu accivities	10	U	U	J	U	U		5.00	/ 49			7.4/	۱ ۵ . د	
	Self Paced														
	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	3.20	****
2	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.26	3.50	****
3 .	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	3.82	****
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.29	****
5	Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.29	****

Course-Section: ART 334 0101
Title GRAPHIC DESIGN IV

Instructor: BELL, KATHRYN L

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 106 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Tarned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_			
				?	3						

Course-Section: ART 334 0201 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 107

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

GRAPHIC DESIGN IV BELL, KATHRYN L Fall 2005

Enrollment: 14 Ouestionnaires: 13

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Ouestions 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 3 5 2 2 3.25 1583/1674 3.30 4.32 4.27 4.26 3.25 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 3 3 4 2 3.42 1535/1674 3.49 4.23 4.21 3.42 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 6 0 1 1 4 0 3.50 1268/1423 3.50 4.27 4.27 4.27 3.50 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 2 2 2 6 2 3.67 1377/1609 3.45 4.34 4.22 4.27 3.67 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 7 0 2 2 1 0 2.80 1507/1585 2.80 3.79 3.96 3.95 2.80 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 6 1 2 2 1 0 2.50 1509/1535 2.56 3.68 4.08 4.15 2.50 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 4 3 2 2 1 2.42 1619/1651 2.60 3.83 4.18 4.16 2.42 2 2 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 929/1673 4.78 4.65 4.69 4.68 4.78 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 2 0 2 6 0 3.20 1528/1586 3.10 4.29 4.43 4.42 3.20 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 1 2 4 3 3.90 1506/1585 3.95 4.76 4.69 4.66 3.90 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 2 2 4 1 3.44 1427/1582 3.37 4.27 4.26 4.26 3.44 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 3 1 4 1 3.33 1423/1575 3.17 4.23 4.27 4.25 3.33 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 3 2 1 2 1 0 2.33 1342/1380 2.52 4.34 3.94 4.01 2.33 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 6 1 1 3.00 1353/1520 3.25 4.17 4.01 4.09 3.00 2 5 2 4.00 1024/1515 3.93 4.52 4.24 4.32 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 2 4 4 0 3.20 1383/1511 3.60 4.53 4.27 4.34 3.20 4. Were special techniques successful 4 3 0 3 1 2 0 2.83 932/994 3.42 4.04 3.94 3.96 2.83 Laboratory 0 1 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 265 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.23 4.26 \*\*\*\* 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 1 0 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 9 0 1 1 0 2 0 2.75 268/ 278 2.75 2.75 4.19 4.24 2.75 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9 1 0 2 0 1 0 2.67 \*\*\*\* / 260 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.46 4.49 \*\*\*\* 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 9 1 0 2 0 1 0 2.67 \*\*\*\* 259 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.33 4.33 \*\*\*\* 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 9 1 0 1 0 2 0 3.33 \*\*\*\*/ 233 \*\*\*\* \*\*\* 4.20 4.18 \*\*\*\* Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 9 1 0 3.33 \*\*\*\*/ 103 \*\*\*\* 4.51 4.41 4.10 \*\*\*\* 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 1 0 1 0 1 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 101 \*\*\*\* 4.69 4.48 4.30 \*\*\*\* 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 95 \*\*\*\* 4.50 4.31 3.91 \*\*\*\* 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 9 1 1 1 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 3.00 93/ 99 3.00 4.33 4.39 4.29 3.00 1 2 1 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 0 2.50 93/ 97 2.50 4.27 4.14 3.48 2.50 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9 0 1 0 2 1 0 2.75 69/ 76 2.75 2.75 3.98 4.03 2.75 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 0 2.67 \*\*\*\*/ 77 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 3.93 3.70 \*\*\*\* 10 0 1 1 1 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 10 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 53 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.45 3.87 \*\*\*\* 1 0 1 9 2 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 48 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.12 3.67 \*\*\*\* 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 0 1 1 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 9 1 0 1 1 0 2.67 \*\*\*\*/ 49 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.27 3.27 \*\*\*\* Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 10 0 1 0 1 1 0 2.67 \*\*\*\*/ 61 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.09 3.20 \*\*\*\* 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal  $\,$  10  $\,$  1 1 0 1 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 52 \*\*\*\* 4.00 4.26 3.50 \*\*\*\* 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 9 1 0 1 1 1 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 50 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.44 3.82 \*\*\*\*

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 10 1 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 \*\*\*\*/ 35 \*\*\*\* 4.00 4.36 3.29 \*\*\*\*

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 10 1 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 31 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.34 4.29 \*\*\*\* Course-Section: ART 334 0201 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN IV

Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I Instructor: BELL, KATHRYN L

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 107 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 335 0101 University of Maryland Title GRAPHIC DESIGN V Baltimore County

Instructor: KIRSTEL, HARVEY Fall 2005

Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 31

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 108 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	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	2	5	4	20	4.35	829/1674	4.35	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	8	16	4.23	968/1674	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	23	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	575/1423	4.50	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	3	1	5	13	4.13	996/1609	4.13	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	4	2	8	14	4.03	748/1585	4.03	3.79	3.96	3.95	4.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	23	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	****/1535	****	3.68	4.08	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	5	3	3	1	4	14	3.92	1201/1651	3.92	3.83	4.18	4.16	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	706/1673	4.90	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	1	2	12	8	4.17	816/1656	4.17	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	23	4.77	474/1586	4.77	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	4	25	4.77	896/1585	4.77	4.76	4.69	4.66	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	8	19	4.53	599/1582	4.53	4.27	4.26	4.26	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	3	7	17	4.27	949/1575	4.27	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	2	3	4	20	4.45	348/1380	4.45	4.34	3.94	4.01	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	3	5	3	9	3.64	1110/1520	3.64	4.17	4.01	4.09	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	5	2	4	2	9		1352/1515	3.36	4.52	4.24	4.32	3.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	4	3	5	9		1210/1511	3.77	4.53	4.27	4.34	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	14	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	432/ 994	4.13	4.04	3.94	3.96	4.13
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.26	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 278	****	2.75	4.19	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.33	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.18	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 103	****	4.51	4.41	4.10	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 101	****	4.69	4.48	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 99	****	4.33	4.39	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 97	****	4.27	4.14	3.48	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	2.75	3.98	4.03	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 49	***	****	4.27	3.27	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	3.20	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.26	3.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	3.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	***	****	4.34	4.29	****

Course-Section: ART 335 0101 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN V Instructor:

KIRSTEL, HARVEY

36

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 31 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 108 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	27	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	6
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 341 0101 Title

INTRO TO ANIMATION

Instructor: Delaney, Rick

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 13

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 109 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	_		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	509/1674		4.32	4.27	4.26	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	721/1674	4.54	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	1	1		****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.27	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	167/1609	4.58	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	452/1585	4.23	3.79	3.96	3.95	4.36 ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2 2	8	1 0	0	0 2	0 4	2 5	4.27	****/1535	****	3.68 3.83	4.08	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.27	843/1651 706/1673	4.09 4.66	4.65	4.18 4.69	4.16 4.68	4.27 4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	381/1656	4.19	4.00	4.09		4.50
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	J	U	U	U	1	J	U	1.50	301/1030	4.10	1.00	1.07	1.07	1.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	708/1586	4.40	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	1142/1585	4.34	4.76	4.69	4.66	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	704/1582	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.26	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	646/1575	4.23	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	278/1380	4.59	4.34	3.94	4.01	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	316/1520	4.37	4.17	4.01	4.09	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	313/1515	4.41	4.52	4.24	4.32	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	610/1511	4.47	4.53	4.27		4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	1	0	0	1	-	4.00	474/ 994			3.94		4.00
I Hold Special Coomingade Bacocestral	_	Ü	_	ŭ	ŭ	_	3	1.00	1,1, 3,1	1.00	1.01	3.71	3.70	1.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	2.75	4.19	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.33	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.18	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.51	4.41	4.10	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 101	****	4.69	4.48	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.33	4.39	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.27	4.14	3.48	***
Field Work	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	0.75	2 00	4 02	***
<ol> <li>Did field experience contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria</li> </ol>	12 12	0	0	0	0	0	1 1		****/ 76 ****/ 77	****	2.75	3.98 3.93	4.03 3.70	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.70	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 49	****	****	4.12	3.07	****
J. Did conferences help you early out field decivities	12	U	O	O	O	O	_	3.00	/ 15			1.27	3.27	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	3.20	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	4.00	4.26	3.50	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	3.82	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.29	****

Course-Section: ART 341 0101 Title

INTRO TO ANIMATION

Instructor: Delaney, Rick

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 13 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 109 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: ART 341 0201 University of Maryland INTRO TO ANIMATION Baltimore County

Title Fall 2005 Instructor: Delaney, Rick

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	14

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

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 110

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

	Questions					NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did	you gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	2	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	509/1674	4.58	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.58
2. Did	the instru	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	379/1674	4.54	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.67
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	2	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	743/1609	4.58	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.33
5. Did a	assigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	1	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	708/1585	4.23	3.79	3.96	3.95	4.09
6. Did v	written as	signments contr	ibute to	o what you learned	l 2	10	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1535	****	3.68	4.08	4.15	****
7. Was	the gradin	g system clearl	y expla:	ined	2	1	1	1	2	1	6	3.91	1228/1651	4.09	3.83	4.18	4.16	3.91
8. How t	many times	was class canc	elled		2	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1300/1673	4.66	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.42
9. How v	would you	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	5 6	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1146/1656	4.19	4.00	4.07	4.07	3.88
		Lectur	е															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well ]	prepared	2	0	0	2	1	2	7	4.17	1211/1586	4.40	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.17
2. Did	the instru	ctor seem inter	ested in	n the subject	2	0	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	1458/1585	4.34	4.76	4.69	4.66	4.08
3. Was	lecture ma	terial presente	d and ex	xplained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	1129/1582	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.26	4.00
4. Did	the lectur	you learned	2	0	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	1208/1575	4.23	4.23	4.27	4.25	3.92		
5. Did a	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand:						1	0	0	0	10	4.64	220/1380	4.59	4.34	3.94	4.01	4.64
1. Did	class disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	777/1520	4.37	4.17	4.01	4.09	4.10
2. Were	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	4	0	0	0	5	0	5	4.00	1024/1515	4.41	4.52	4.24	4.32	4.00
				d open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	0	7	4.40	751/1511	4.47	4.53	4.27	4.34	4.40
4. Were	special t	echniques succe	ssful	_	4	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	4.00	4.04	3.94	3.96	****
		Self	Paced															
1. Did :	self-paced	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	3.20	****
				Fred	quency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
								_					_				,	
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	; 			Re	ason	s 			Тур	e 			Majors	; 
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduate	<u> </u>	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General							1	Under-gr	ad 1	.4	Non-	-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives						0	#### - N				_	ιh	
				P 0								response	s to b	e sign	nificar	nt		
				I 0		Other					8							
				? 0	? 0													

Course-Section: ART 342 0101 University of Maryland Page 111 Title FILM/VIDEO THEORY & CR Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006

Instructor: WORDEN, FRED

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 10

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	433/1674	4.63	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	697/1423	4.40	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	222/1609	4.75	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	326/1585	4.50	3.79	3.96	3.95	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	870/1535	4.00	3.68	4.08	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	866/1651	4.25	3.83	4.18	4.16	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	796/1673	4.86	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	292/1656	4.63	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.29	4.43	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	199/1582	4.86	4.27	4.26	4.26	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.25	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.34	3.94	4.01	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	Ο	1	7	4.88	151/1520	4.88	4.17	4.01	4.09	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	384/1515	4.75	4.52	4.24	4.32	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.53	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 994	****	4.04	3.94	3.96	****

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

#### Course-Section: ART 345 0101 University of Maryland Page 112 Title FILM II:SOUND & IMAGE Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006

COOK, CATHY

Instructor: Enrollment: 8

Questionnaires: 8

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

					Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
		Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 L															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.26	5.00
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.50
3. Did th	ie exam qi	estions reflec	the ex	xpected goals	2	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.27	****
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	312/1609	4.67	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.67
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ate to	what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	612/1585	4.20	3.79	3.96	3.95	4.20
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	o what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1332/1535	3.40	3.68	4.08	4.15	3.40
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly	y expla:	ined	3	0	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	1562/1651	3.00	3.83	4.18	4.16	3.00
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	887/1673	4.80	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.80
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.50
		Lectur	9															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well p	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1211/1586	4.17	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.17
		tor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	737/1585	4.83	4.76	4.69	4.66	4.83
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1348/1582	3.67	4.27	4.26	4.26	3.67
4. Did th	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	1	2	3	4.33	886/1575	4.33	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.33
5. Did au	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandin						0	0	0	2	4	4.67	200/1380	4.67	4.34	3.94	4.01	4.67
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu			what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	572/1520	4.33	4.17	4.01	4.09	4.33
				d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2		4.67	483/1515	4.67	4.52	4.24	4.32	4.67
				d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	4		507/1511	4.67	4.53	4.27	4.34	4.67
		echniques succe			2	4	1	0	0	1	0		964/ 994			3.94		2.50
				Frequ	enas	ni a	trib	1+ i 0:	n									
				rrequ	terrey	DIS	CIID	1010.	.1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	 5	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1			-			_						3 -		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				1	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0													-	
Grad.	rad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0						ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	<sub>j</sub> h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Other				4	_							
		? 1																

 Course-Section:
 ART 346 0101
 University of Maryland
 Page 113

 Title
 VIDEO II
 Baltimore County
 JAN 21, 2006

 Instructor:
 GRABILL, VIN
 Fall 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	10			
Questionnaires:	10	Student Cour	rse Evaluation	Questionnaire

					Frequencies					Inst	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 y	you gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.50
2. Did t	the instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	248/1674	4.78	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.78
3. Did t	the exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	335/1423	4.70	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.70
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	202/1609	4.78	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.78
5. Did a	assigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	5	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	1440/1585	3.00	3.79	3.96	3.95	3.00
6. Did w	written as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	5	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1406/1535	3.20	3.68	4.08	4.15	3.20
7. Was t	the grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	673/1651	4.40	3.83	4.18	4.16	4.40
8. How n	many times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1203/1673	4.50	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.50
9. How w	would you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	118/1656	4.88	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.88
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	389/1586	4.80	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.80
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	567/1585		4.76	4.69	4.66	4.90
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	2	8	4.80	246/1582		4.27	4.26	4.26	4.80
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	1	0	8	4.78	327/1575	4.78	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.78
5. Did a	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandin						0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.34	3.94	4.01	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did o	class disc			what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	151/1520	4.88	4.17	4.01	4.09	4.88
				ed to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	7		360/1515		4.52	4.24	4.32	4.78
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	266/1511		4.53		4.34	4.89
		echniques succe			1	6	0	0	0	1	2		148/ 994			3.94		4.67
				Frequ		. Dia	⊦ wib	.+	_									
				Frequ	iency	DIS	CLID	JLIOI	1									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2			-			-						3 -		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Gei	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0									J				-	
Grad.	0	0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0					ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0						respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt				
				I 0	0 Other				7	-								
				? 0														

Course-Section: ART 351 0101

Title BLACK & WHITE PHOTO

Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 19

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 114 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	Frequencies Inst NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean			ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean					
Questions														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	1	0	0	6	9	4.38	804/1674	4.38	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	292/1674	4.73	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	12	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.27	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	222/1609	4.75	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	7	1	7	3.88	936/1585	3.88	3.79	3.96	3.95	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	1	3	4	6		1057/1535	3.87	3.68	4.08	4.15	3.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	0	6	9	4.44	628/1651	4.44	3.83	4.18	4.16	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	10			1397/1673	4.29	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	163/1656	4.79	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	431/1586	4.79	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	453/1585	4.93	4.76	4.69	4.66	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1		11	4.71	366/1582	4.71	4.27	4.26	4.26	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	311/1575	4.79	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	161/1380	4.73	4.34	3.94	4.01	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	173/1520	4.83	4.17	4.01	4.09	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.52	4.24	4.32	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.53	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	408/ 994	4.17	4.04	3.94	3.96	4.17
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	2.75	4.19	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.33	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.18	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.51	4.41	4.10	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 101	****	4.69	4.48	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 99	****	4.33	4.39	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.27	4.14	3.48	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 76	****	2.75	3.98	4.03	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	3.20	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 52	****	4.00	4.26	3.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	3.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.29	****

Course-Section: ART 351 0101

Title BLACK & WHITE PHOTO

Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 114 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	19	Non-major	12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

#### Course-Section: ART 356 0101 University of Maryland Title ALTERNATIVE PROCESSES Baltimore County Fall 2005

Instructor: PEREGOY, CHRIST

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 115

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	233/1674	4.81	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	931/1674	4.25	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	852/1609	4.25	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	865/1585	3.93	3.79	3.96	3.95	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1535	****	3.68	4.08	4.15	***
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	4	2	0	7	1	2	3.08	1556/1651	3.08	3.83	4.18	4.16	3.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	13	2	4.06	1541/1673	4.06	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	719/1656	4.25	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	3	6	4		1356/1586		4.29	4.43	4.42	3.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	397/1585	4.94	4.76	4.69	4.66	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	924/1582	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.26	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	867/1575	4.36	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	426/1380	4.33	4.34	3.94	4.01	4.33
Discussion														
	2	0	0	1	4	7	2	2 00	006/1500	2 00	1 17	4.01	4.09	2 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	Τ	4	7	1 2	3.80	986/1520	3.80	4.17		1.00	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	254/1515	4.87	4.52	4.24	4.32	4.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	Τ	2	12	4.73	436/1511	4.73	4.53	4.27	4.34	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	691/ 994	3.63	4.04	3.94	3.96	3.63

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	17	Non-major	1
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ART 359 0101 University of Maryland Title TOPICS IN PHOTOGRAPHY

Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 116

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	432/1674	4.64	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.27	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	192/1609	4.79	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	593/1585	4.21	3.79	3.96	3.95	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	4	2	2	4	3.50	1295/1535	3.50	3.68	4.08	4.15	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	3.83	4.18	4.16	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	1289/1673	4.43	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	131/1656	4.85	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	Λ	Ω	Λ	Λ	Λ	5	q	4.64	693/1586	4.64	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	689/1585		4.76	4.69	4.66	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	394/1582		4.27	4.26	4.26	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	523/1575		4.23	4.27	4.25	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	167/1380	4.71	4.34	3.94	4.01	4.71
Discussion		_	_				_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	316/1520	4.64	4.17	4.01	4.09	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	289/1515	4.83	4.52	4.24	4.32	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.53	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	4.04	3.94	3.96	4.00

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	14	Non-major	1
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 360 0101

MIXED MEDIA BOOK ARTS

Title Instructor: CHAN, IRENE

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 12

Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 117 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		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	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	298/1674				4.26	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	483/1674	4.58	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.27	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	852/1609	4.25	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	7	2	0		1517/1585	2.75	3.79	3.96	3.95	2.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	6	0	0		1501/1535	2.63	3.68	4.08	4.15	2.63
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	0	0	0	2	3	5	2		1410/1651	3.58	3.83	4.18	4.16	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5			1175/1673	4.55	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	1144/1586	4.25	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	_	4.92	510/1585	4.92	4.76	4.69	4.66	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	762/1582	4.42	4.27	4.26	4.26	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	359/1575	4.75	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	666/1380	4.00		3.94	4.01	4.00
5. 214 dddioviddai cedmiiqaed emanee year anaerbanaing	_		Ū	_	_	J		1.00	000, 1000	1.00	1.51	3.71	1.01	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	780/1520	4.09	4.17	4.01	4.09	4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	996/1515	4.09	4.52	4.24	4.32	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	535/1511	4.64	4.53	4.27	4.34	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	322/ 994	4.33	4.04	3.94	3.96	4.33
Laboratory			_				_							
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	2.75	4.19	4.24	***
Seminar														
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 99	****	4.33	4.39	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	4.27	4.14	3.48	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 76	****	2.75	3.98	4.03	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	3.20	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 52	****	4.00	4.26	3.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	1	0	0	0			****	5.00	4.44	3.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.29	****
1. Has the recaston, eacoring by proceeds neighbor		U	5	5	_	5	J	5.00	, 33		1.00	1.50	5.45	
_		- B-2	1											

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	12	Non-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Ĺ

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 5

Course-Section: ART 382 0101 University of Maryland Page 118
Title INTERACTIVITY Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: THWING, JENNIE Fall 2005
Enrollment: 12

Questionnaires: 12 Student Course Evaluation Questionnair	Ouestionnaires:	12	St.udent.	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnair
---	-----------------	----	-----------	--------	------------	--------------

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fro	-	ncies	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	_															
		ew insights,ski			6	0	0	1	1	1	3		1196/1674		4.32	4.27	4.26	4.00
		ctor make clear			6	0	0	2	1	2	1		1559/1674		4.23	4.23	4.21	3.33
	_	estions reflec		_	6	5	0	0	0	0	1		****/1423		4.27	4.27	4.27	****
		ations reflect			7	3	0	0	1	0	1		****/1609		4.34	4.22	4.27	****
	_	_		what you learned	6	3	2	0	0	0	1		1557/1585		3.79	3.96	3.95	2.33
		g system clearl		ined	6	1	0	1	1	1	2		1289/1651	3.80	3.83	4.18	4.16	3.80
	-	was class canc			6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1673		4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How wou	uld you 🤉	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	7	0	0	1	4	0	0	2.80	1592/1656	2.80	4.00	4.07	4.07	2.80
		Lectur		_														
		actor's lecture			6	0	0	1	2	0	3		1391/1586		4.29	4.43	4.42	3.83
	the instructor seem interested in the subject lecture material presented and explained clearing the lectures contribute to what you learned			3	6	0	0	0	1	2	3		1354/1585		4.76	4.69	4.66	4.33
					6	0	0	1	2	1	2		1348/1582		4.27	4.26	4.26	3.67
	the lectures contribute to what you learned			-	7	0	1	0	1	2			1402/1575		4.23	4.27	4.25	3.40
5. Did aud	d the lectures contribute to what you learned d audiovisual techniques enhance your understan			our understanding	6	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	962/1380	3.67	4.34	3.94	4.01	3.67
	•																	
		Discus						_										
				what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	Ţ	1		1092/1520		4.17	4.01	4.09	3.67
		_	_	d to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	827/1515		4.52	4.24	4.32	4.33
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	Τ	4.50	****/1511	****	4.53	4.27	4.34	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
				•	-													
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	aiors	- <b></b> -	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	в 0			1									3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Ge	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	major	8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	0	D 0								-	9				5	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enous	h
	-	2.22 2.00	=	P 0								-	respons				_	
				I O		Ot.	her					2					-	
				? 0			-											

Course-Section: ART 384 0101

COMPUTER ANIMATION

Title Instructor: McIntyre, Frank

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 10 Fall 2005

Page 119 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	eauer	ncies	\$		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	367/1674	4.70	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	215/1674	4.80	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.27	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.34	4.22	4.27	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	512/1585	4.30	3.79	3.96	3.95	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1535	****	3.68	4.08	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	673/1651	4.40	3.83	4.18	4.16	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1203/1673	4.50	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	615/1656	4.33	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	663/1586	4.67	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	7		438/1582	4.67	4.27	4.26	4.26	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	495/1575	4.67	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	272/1380	4.56	4.34	3.94	4.01	4.56
Discussion	_			•		_			000/4500					
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	229/1520	4.75	4.17	4.01	4.09	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	384/1515	4.75	4.52	4.24	4.32	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.53	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	4.04	3.94	3.96	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	***	2.75	4.19	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 260	****	2.75 ****	4.19	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.49	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 233	****	****	4.33	4.33	****
5. Were requirements for tab reports creatry specified	פ	U	U	U	U	U	_	5.00	/ 233			4.20	4.10	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.51	4.41	4.10	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.69	4.48	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 99	****	4.33	4.39	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	4.27	4.14	3.48	****
The second secon														
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.75	3.98	4.03	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	3.20	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.26	3.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	3.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.29	***

Course-Section: ART 384 0101 Title

COMPUTER ANIMATION

Instructor: McIntyre, Frank

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 10 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 119 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ART 385 0101

14

DIGITAL MONTAGE

THOMPSON, CALLA

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 14

Page 120 JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

- · ·				
Student	('Ollred	Fivaluation	Ouestionnaire	4

				Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	3	0	11	4.57	521/1674	4.57	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.57
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	406/1674	4.64	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.64
		uestions reflec			0	10	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	575/1423	4.50	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.50
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	192/1609	4.79	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.79
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	3	0	2	5	2	2	3.36	1315/1585	3.36	3.79	3.96	3.95	3.36
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	3	0	2	4	5	0	3.27	1378/1535	3.27	3.68	4.08	4.15	3.27
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	912/1651	4.21	3.83	4.18	4.16	4.21
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	1289/1673	4.43	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.43
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	185/1656	4.75	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.75
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	336/1586	4.83	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.83
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.66	5.00
3. Was le	d the instructor seem interested in the subject is lecture material presented and explained clear id the lectures contribute to what you learned				2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	217/1582	4.83	4.27	4.26	4.26	4.83
4. Did th	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned			you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	495/1575	4.67	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.67
5. Did au	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand				3	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	161/1380	4.73	4.34	3.94	4.01	4.73
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	397/1520	4.50	4.17	4.01	4.09	4.50
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	384/1515	4.75	4.52	4.24	4.32	4.75
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.53	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		2	8	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	732/ 994	3.50	4.04	3.94	3.96	3.50
				Frequ	ency	7 Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Expected Grades				Re:	asons	3			Ту	ne			Majors	<b>.</b>			
	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gr																	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3		~		,				_	1	, ,				0
	56-83 3 2.00-2.99 1 C 1					Gei	nera:	L				5	Under-g	rad 1	L <b>4</b>	Non-	-major	0
	84-150 4 3.00-3.49 8 D 0			2 0								1			1			.1-
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0					Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### - 1				_	ın
				P 0		0.3	1					7	respons	es to k	oe sign	ııııcar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her					7						

Course-Section: ART 388 0101 University of Mary Title ART ON THE INTERNET Baltimore Count Instructor: REINSEL, JOSEPH Fall 2005

Enrollment:

8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 121

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	6	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------------	---	---------	--------	------------	---------------

	Questions						Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	3	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	_	Genera	_															
		w insights,ski			0	0	0	1	3	2	0		1603/1674		4.32	4.27	4.26	3.17
		tor make clear			0	0	0	3	1	2	0		1639/1674		4.23	4.23	4.21	2.83
	_	estions reflec		-	0	5	0	0	0	1	0		****/1423		4.27	4.27	4.27	
		ations reflect		pected goals what you learned	0	0 1	0	0 1	3 2	3 2	0		1452/1609 1385/1585		4.34 3.79	4.22	4.27 3.95	3.50 3.20
				o what you learned	0		0	0	1	0	0		****/1535		3.79	4.08	4.15	3.∠U ****
		system clearl			0	1	2	1	2	0	0		1636/1651		3.83	4.18	4.15	2.00
		was class canc		IIIed	0	0	0	0	0	4	2		1361/1673		4.65	4.69	4.68	4.33
	-			hing effectiveness	2	1	0	1	2	0	0		1610/1656		4.00	4.07	4.07	2.67
1 Ware t	he instru	Lectur ctor's lecture.		nrenared	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	3 00	1539/1586	3.00	4.29	4.43	4.42	3.00
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	0	1	2	3		1354/1585		4.76	4.69	4.66	4.33
				xplained clearly	0	0	1	2	1	2	0		1557/1582		4.27	4.26	4.26	2.67
		s contribute t			0	0	1	1	2	2	0		1524/1575		4.23	4.27	4.25	2.83
				our understanding	0	1	0	0	2	2	1				4.34		4.01	3.80
1 Did al		Discus		what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	2 17	1315/1520	3.17	4.17	4.01	4.09	3.17
				d to participate	0	0	0	1	1	3	2		1167/1515		4.17	4.01	4.09	3.17
				d co participate d open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	2	2		1050/1511	4.00	4.53	4.27	4.34	4.00
		chniques succe		a open arbeabsion	0	4	0	0	1	1	0		732/ 994			3.94		3.50
	-	-																
0		Labora	-	1	-	0	0	•	-	•	_	2 00	****	ale ale ale ale	0 85	4 10	4 04	***
				ground information or lab activities	5 5	0	0	0 1	U T	0	0	3.00	****/ 278 ****/ 260	****	2.75 ****	4.19	4.24	****
J. WEIC II	cccssary	materials avai	IGDIC I	or lab accivities	3	O	O	_	O	O	Ü	2.00	/ 200			1.10	1.15	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	 quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	 5	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0						J								-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	nera:	L				6	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0				#### - 1				_	jh				
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0	Other							0						

Course-Section: ART 389B 0101 University of Maryland LANDSCRAPE CUBED

Enrollment:

11

Title Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 BAILEY, DAN Job IRBR3029 Instructor:

Page 122

Questionnaires:	11	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------------	----	---------	--------	------------	---------------

			Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	Λ	0	3	7	4.70	367/1674	4.70	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	737/1674		4.23	4.23	4.21	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	2	3		1094/1609		4.34	4.22	4.27	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	1	1	0	1		1329/1585	3.33	3.79	3.96	3.95	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	1	2	0		1207/1535		3.68	4.08	4.15	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	901/1651	4.22	3.83	4.18	4.16	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	887/1673		4.65	4.69	4.68	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	170/1656		4.00	4.07	4.07	4.78
J. now would for grade one overall codoning erroceiveness	_	Ü	Ü	ŭ	ŭ	_	•	11,0	1,0,1000	1.70	1.00	1.07	1.07	1.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	581/1586	4.71	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	640/1585	4.88	4.76	4.69	4.66	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.27	4.26	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	612/1575	4.57	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.34	3.94	4.01	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	191/1520	4.80	4.17	4.01	4.09	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.52	4.24	4.32	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.53	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	4.04	3.94	3.96	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.51	4.41	4.10	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.69	4.48	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.33	4.39	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.27	4.14	3.48	****
From	ienai	, Dist	trib	u+ i o:	n									
rred.	испсу	ומדת	CLID	ucio.	11									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	

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

#### Course-Section: ART 392 0101 University of Maryland Page 123 Title TOPICS IN ART OR MEDIA Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005

Instructor: IVY, JEANNE C.

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 .1															
1. Did	you gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.26	5.00
2. Did	the instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	161/1674	4.87	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.88
3. Did	the exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	4	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.27	****
4. Did	other evalu	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	136/1609	4.94	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.88
5. Did	assigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	251/1585	4.53	3.79	3.96	3.95	4.63
6. Did	written ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	3	3	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	578/1535	4.45	3.68	4.08	4.15	4.33
7. Was	the grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	330/1651	4.76	3.83	4.18	4.16	4.67
8. How	many times	was class cand	elled		3	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1267/1673	4.58	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.44
9. How	would you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1656	4.92	4.00	4.07	4.07	5.00
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were	the instru	uctor's lecture		prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	336/1586	4.85	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.83
		ctor seem inter			6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.66	5.00
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	217/1582	4.92	4.27	4.26	4.26	4.83
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				6	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	495/1575	4.83	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.67
5. Did	audiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	6	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1380	4.93	4.34	3.94	4.01	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class disc			what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	810/1520	4.36	4.17	4.01	4.09	4.00
				ed to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	483/1515	4.83	4.52	4.24	4.32	4.67
		-	_	nd open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	507/1511		4.53	4.27	4.34	4.67
				Frequ	iency	, Dist	trib	utio	ı									
Credits	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							Rea	asons	; - <b></b>			Ту]	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0	0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6				Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2	-													
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				2	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	major	4

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

#### Course-Section: ART 392 0201 University of Maryland Title TOPICS IN ART OR MEDIA Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: IVY, JEANNE C.

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 9

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 124

				1	ncies	_		1110	ructor	Course	DCPC	OFIDC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.26	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	176/1674	4.87	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.27	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1609	4.94	4.34	4.22	4.27	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	395/1585	4.53	3.79	3.96	3.95	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1 2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	310/1535	4.45	3.68	4.08	4.15	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	145/1651	4.76	3.83	4.18	4.16	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	1015/1673	4.58	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	136/1656	4.92	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	301/1586	4.85	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1582	4.92	4.27	4.26	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1575	4.83	4.23	4.27	4.25	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	96/1380	4.93	4.34	3.94	4.01	4.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	259/1520	4.36	4.17	4.01	4.09	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1515	4.83	4.52	4.24	4.32	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1511	4.83	4.53	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	****	4.04	3.94	3.96	****
Fred	quency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	5			Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	

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

#### Course-Section: ART 392C 0101 University of Maryland Page 125 Title DESIGN AND MARKETING Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005

Instructor: YAGER, DAVID

Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

								equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did 110	aain n	General w insights,skil	_	. this source	3	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	671/1674	4.46	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.46
		ctor make clear			4	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	721/1674	4.42	4.23	4.27	4.20	4.40
		lestions reflect			3	10	0	0	2	0	1		****/1423	****	4.23	4.23	4.21	****
	_	uations reflect		_	3	1	0	0	1	5		4.42	629/1609		4.27	4.27	4.27	4.42
			_	what you learned	4	0	1	2	1	8	0		1329/1585		3.79	3.96	3.95	3.33
	_	_		what you learned what you learned	3	1	1	1	4	6	0		1386/1535		3.68	4.08	4.15	3.25
		g system clearly		-	3	2	0	2	3	6	0		1496/1651		3.83	4.18	4.16	3.36
		was class cance		Linea	3	0	0	0	2	11	-		1630/1673		4.65	4.69	4.68	3.85
				ning effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	1	9		106/1656		4.00	4.07		4.90
J. HOW WO	dia you s	grade the overa.	LI CEACI	iiig effectivelless	U	O	U	U	U		,	4.50	100/1030	4.50	4.00	1.07	4.07	4.50
		Lecture	_															
1. Were t	he instr	actor's lectures		prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	618/1586	4.69	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.69
		ctor seem inter	_	_	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	713/1585		4.76	4.69	4.66	4.85
				plained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	798/1582		4.27	4.26	4.26	4.38
		es contribute to			3	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	838/1575		4.23	4.27	4.25	4.38
			-	our understanding	3	1	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	489/1380		4.34		4.01	
				_	_	-	•	_	_	_								
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribu	ite to v	what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	572/1520	4.33	4.17	4.01	4.09	4.33
2. Were a	ıll studer	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	453/1515	4.70	4.52	4.24	4.32	4.70
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage i	air and	d open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	447/1511	4.73	4.53	4.27	4.34	4.73
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	ssful		5	4	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	657/ 994	3.71	4.04	3.94	3.96	3.71
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	า									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	s Reasons								Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10			 quir					2	Graduat		0	Majc		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	A 10 B 4		re(	darr.	=u 10	)	ajui	D	4	Graduat	<b>=</b>	U	Ma JC	, <u>T</u>	U
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	ı				8	Under-q	rad 1	6	Non-	major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D 0		Gei	иста.	L				J	onder -g.	Luu 1	. •	INOII-	ilia JOI	ر
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		E14	ecti	7es				0	#### - 1	Means +	here a	re not	enous	rh
Graa.	J	3.30 1.00	5	P 0		11.17	CCLI	,				•	respons				_	111
				I O		O+1	her					4	TCDPOHD		5191			
				5 0		001						•						

Course-Section: ART 392D 0101

CONCEPTUAL DESIGN

Title YAGER, DAVID Instructor:

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 11

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 126 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  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  1. O 1 0 2 1 2 2 3 3.30 1558/1674 3.80 4.32 4.27 4.25 3.8  3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1. O 1 0 1 1 3.67 1214/1423 3.67 4.27 4.27 3.6  4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals  1. O 1 0 1 1 3.67 1214/1423 3.67 4.27 4.27 3.6  5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  1. O 1 1 0 2 3 3.375 1320/1609 3.75 4.4 4.22 4.27 3.7  5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  1. O 1 1 2 3 0 3.375 1320/1609 3.75 4.34 4.22 4.27 3.7  6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  1. O 1 1 2 3 0 3.33 1355/1535 3.33 3.68 4.08 4.15 3.3  7. Was the grading system clearly explained  1. O 1 0 0 0 2 5 3 4.10 1525/1673 4.10 4.65 4.69 4.66 4.18  8. How many times was class cancelled  1. O 1 1 1 5 2 3.60 1460/1586 3.60 4.29 4.43 4.42 3.6  9. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared  1. O 1 1 1 2 6 4.30 1374/1585 4.30 4.76 4.69 4.66 4.3  9. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. O 1 1 2 2 4 2.8 5.0 1406/1582 3.50 4.27 4.26 3.5  9. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  2. O 2 1 2 4 3.89 810/1380 3.89 4.34 3.94 4.01 3.8  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. O 0 1 3 2 4 3.90 924/1520 3.90 4.17 4.01 4.09 3.9  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  1. O 0 1 1 2 2 6 3.60 1460/1586 3.60 4.29 4.43 4.3  9. Was the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. O 0 1 3 2 2 4 3.90 924/1520 3.90 4.17 4.01 4.09 3.9  2. Were pour provided with adequate background information  1. Did the instructor available for individual attention  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  2. Did you clearl				Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
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 4. Did other waluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Did assigned readings gystem clearly explained 7. Did assigned readings gystem clearly explained 7. Did gyrad the examily explained 7. Did gyrad the examily explained 7. Did gyrad the expected goals 8. How many times was clear be expected goals 8. How many times was clear be expected goals 9. How ould you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Did will be examily explained 1. Did gyrad the examily explained exp	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
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 4. Did other waluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Did assigned readings gystem clearly explained 7. Did assigned readings gystem clearly explained 7. Did gyrad the examily explained 7. Did gyrad the examily explained 7. Did gyrad the expected goals 8. How many times was clear be expected goals 8. How many times was clear be expected goals 9. How ould you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Did will be examily explained 1. Did gyrad the examily explained exp	Conoral														
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 2 1 2 2 3 3.30 1568/1674 3.30 4.23 4.23 4.21 3.3 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 7 0 1 1 0 1 1 3 5.75 1214/1423 3.67 4.27 4.27 4.27 3.6 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 2 1 1 0 0 3 3 3.75 1320/1609 3.75 4.34 4.22 4.27 3.6 5. Did sasigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 2 1 3 2 2 0 2.63 1537/1585 2.63 3.79 3.95 3.95 2.6 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 4 0 1 2 3 0 3.33 1553/1535 3.33 3.68 4.08 4.15 3.3 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 7 1 1 0 0 1 2 3 0 3.33 1553/1535 3.33 3.68 4.08 4.15 3.3 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 2 5 3 4.10 1525/1673 4.10 4.65 4.69 4.68 4.1 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 0 1 2 4 4.00 955/1656 4.00 4.00 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07		1	Λ	1	Ω	2	Δ	2	3 80	1385/1674	3 80	4 32	4 27	4 26	3 80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 7 0 1 0 1 1 3.67 1214/1423 3.67 4.27 4.27 3.6 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 2 1 1 0 0 3 3 3.75 1320/1609 3.75 4.34 4.22 4.27 3.6 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 2 1 3 2 2 0 2.63 1537/1885 2.63 3.79 3.96 3.95 2.6 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 7 1 1 0 1 0 2.33 1623/1651 3.33 3.68 4.08 4.15 3.3 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 7 1 1 0 1 0 2.33 1623/1651 2.33 3.83 4.18 4.16 2.3 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 2 5 3 4.10 1525/1673 4.10 4.65 4.69 4.68 4.19 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 0 1 2 4 4.00 955/1665 4.00 4.05 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.08 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09				_	•		2								3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Did assigned readings system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. O 1 0 1 2 3 10 1323/1651 2.33 3.83 4.18 4.16 2.3  8. How many times was class cancelled 1. O 0 0 2 5 3 4.10 1525/16573 4.10 4.65 4.69 4.68 4.19  9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. O 0 0 2 5 3 4.10 1525/16573 4.10 4.65 4.69 4.68 4.19  1. Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. O 0 1 1 1 5 2 3.60 1460/1586 3.60 4.29 4.43 4.42 3.6  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. O 0 1 1 1 2 4 3.50 1460/1586 3.60 4.29 4.43 4.42 3.6  2. Did the instructor seem interested and explained clearly 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. O 0 2 1 2 4 3.89 810/1380 3.89 4.34 3.94 4.01 3.8  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. Did the lab instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6. Did the lab instructor available for lab activities 7. Were recessary materials available for lab activities 8. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 9. O 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			-	_	_	_		_		,					3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. All 1 2 3 0 2 0 2.63 1537/1585 2.63 3.79 3.96 3.95 2.66 8. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8. How many times was class cancelled 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 0 1 2 3 0 2.33 1623/1651 2.33 3.68 4.08 4.15 2.3 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 0 1 2 4 4.00 955/1655 4.00 4.00 4.07 4.07 4.07  Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did presentations contribute to what yo			2	1		0		3							3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 7 1 1 1 0 1 0 2.33 1633/1651 2.33 3.83 4.18 4.16 2.3 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 2 5 3 4.10 1525/1673 4.10 4.65 4.69 4.68 4.69 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 0 1 2 4 4.00 955/1656 4.00 4.00 4.07 4.07 4.07  Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 1 1 1 5 2 3.60 1460/1586 3.60 4.29 4.43 4.42 3.6 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 1 2 6 4.30 1374/1585 4.30 4.76 4.69 4.68 4.3 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 1 1 2 4 2 3.50 1406/1582 3.50 4.27 4.26 4.26 3.5 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 3 3 3 3.80 1264/1575 3.80 4.23 4.27 4.25 3.8 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 2 1 2 4 3.89 810/1380 3.89 4.34 3.94 4.01 3.8  Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 3 2 4 3.90 924/1520 3.90 4.17 4.01 4.09 3.8 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 1 3 2 6 4.30 857/1515 4.30 4.52 4.24 4.32 4.3 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 642/1511 4.50 4.53 4.27 4.34 4.51 4. Were special techniques successful 1 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 278 **** 2.75 4.19 4.24 *** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 278 **** 2.75 4.19 4.24 *** 4. Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0						2		0							2.63
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 2 5 3 4.10 1525/1673 4.10 4.65 4.69 4.68 4.10 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 0 1 2 4 4.00 955/1656 4.00 4.00 4.07 4.07 4.01  Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 1 1 1 5 2 3.60 1460/1586 3.60 4.29 4.43 4.42 3.61 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 1 1 2 6 4.30 1374/1585 4.30 4.76 4.69 4.66 4.31 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 1 1 2 6 4.30 1374/1585 4.30 4.76 4.69 4.66 4.31 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 3 3 3 3.80 1264/1575 3.80 4.27 4.26 4.26 3.55 4. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 2 1 2 4 3.89 810/1380 3.89 4.34 3.94 4.01 3.81  Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 3 2 4 3.90 924/1520 3.90 4.17 4.01 4.09 3.91 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 1 1 2 6 4.30 857/1515 4.30 4.52 4.24 4.32 4.31 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 1 0 0 1 1 2 6 4.30 857/1515 4.30 4.52 4.24 4.32 4.31 4. Were special techniques successful 1 1 1 0 3 3 3 2 3.56 715/ 994 3.56 4.04 3.94 3.96 3.51  Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 278 **** 2.75 4.19 4.24 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0.00 ****/ 10 1 **** 4.69 4.48 4.30 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1355/1535	3.33	3.68	4.08	4.15	3.33
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared   1	7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	7	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1623/1651	2.33	3.83	4.18	4.16	2.33
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  1. O 1 1 1 1 5 2 3.60 1460/1586 3.60 4.29 4.43 4.42 3.61 2.0 12 14 15 15 2 3.60 1460/1586 3.60 4.29 4.43 4.42 3.61 2.0 12 14 15 15 2 3.60 1460/1586 3.60 4.29 4.43 4.42 3.61 2.0 12 14 2.0 14 2.0 12 14 2.0 12 14 2.0 12 14 2.0 12 14 2.0 12 14 2.0 12 14 2.0 12 14 2.0 12 14 2.0 12 14 2.0 12 14 2.0 12 14 2.0 12 14 2.0 14 2	8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1525/1673	4.10	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.10
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. 0 1 1 1 5 2 3.60 1460/1586 3.60 4.29 4.43 4.42 3.60 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. 0 0 1 1 2 6 4.30 1374/1585 4.30 4.76 4.69 4.66 4.31 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did did the lectures contribute to what you learned 7. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 8. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 1. Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 1. Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 1. Did the lab contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 1. Did you clearly understand your evalua	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 1 2 2 6 4.30 1374/1585 4.30 4.76 4.69 4.66 4.31 3.0 was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 1 1 2 4 2 3.50 1406/1582 3.50 4.27 4.26 4.26 3.51 4.20 4.25 3.50 4.27 4.26 3.50 4.26 3.51 4.20 4.25 3.50 4.27 4.26 3.51 4.20 4.25 3.50 4.27 4.26 3.51 4.27 4.25 3.50 4.27 4.26 3.51 4.27 4.25 3.50 4.27 4.26 3.51 4.27 4.25 3.50 4.27 4.26 3.51 4.27 4.25 3.50 4.27 4.26 3.51 4.27 4.25 3.50 4.27 4.25 4.25 3.50 4.27 4.25 4.25 4.25 4.25 4.25 4.25 4.25 4.25	Lecture														
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 1 1 2 4 2 3.50 1406/1582 3.50 4.27 4.26 4.26 3.54 1.0 id the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 3 3 3 3.80 1264/1575 3.80 4.23 4.27 4.25 3.80 5.0 id audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 2 1 2 4 3.89 810/1380 3.89 4.34 3.94 4.01 3.80    Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 3 2 4 3.89 810/1380 3.89 4.17 4.01 4.09 3.90   2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 1 1 2 6 4.30 857/1515 4.30 4.52 4.24 4.32 4.31   3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 642/1511 4.50 4.53 4.27 4.34 4.51   4. Were special techniques successful 1 1 1 0 3 3 2 3.56 715/994 3.56 4.04 3.94 3.96 3.50    Laboratory  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/278 **** 2.75 4.19 4.24 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/259 **** **** 4.46 4.49 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 10 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	5	2	3.60	1460/1586	3.60	4.29	4.43	4.42	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 3 3 3 3.80 1264/1575 3.80 4.23 4.27 4.25 3.86 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 2 1 2 4 3.89 810/1380 3.89 4.34 3.94 4.01 3.89    Discussion  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 3 2 4 3.90 924/1520 3.90 4.17 4.01 4.09 3.99 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 1 1 2 6 4.30 857/1515 4.30 4.52 4.24 4.32 4.31 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 642/1511 4.50 4.53 4.27 4.34 4.51 4. Were special techniques successful 1 1 1 1 0 3 3 2 3.56 715/994 3.56 4.04 3.94 3.96 3.50    Laboratory  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 278 **** 2.75 4.19 4.24 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 259 **** **** 4.46 4.49 *** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 10 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 259 **** **** 4.33 4.33 ****    Seminar  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			-												4.30
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 3 2 4 3.99 924/1520 3.90 4.17 4.01 4.09 3.99 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 1 1 2 6 4.30 857/1515 4.30 4.52 4.24 4.32 4.31 3.94 3.96 3.96 4.04 3.96 3.96 4.07 4.01 4.09 3.96 3.90 4.17 4.01 4.09 3.96 3.96 4.00 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50			-	_			_	_							3.50
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions discussion  1. Did class discussions discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions discussion  1. Did class discussion  1. Did class discussions discussion  1. Did class discussion  2. Did vit class discussion  3. All discussion  3. All dis			-	-											3.80
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 3 2 4 3.90 924/1520 3.90 4.17 4.01 4.09 3.90 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 1 1 2 6 4.30 857/1515 4.30 4.52 4.24 4.32 4.31 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 642/1511 4.50 4.53 4.27 4.34 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.5	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	2	1	2	4	3.89	810/1380	3.89	4.34	3.94	4.01	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 1 1 2 6 4.30 857/1515 4.30 4.52 4.24 4.32 4.33 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 642/1511 4.50 4.53 4.27 4.34 4.51 4. Were special techniques successful 1 1 1 0 3 3 3 2 3.56 715/994 3.56 4.04 3.94 3.96 3.56															
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 642/1511 4.50 4.53 4.27 4.34 4.50 4. Were special techniques successful 1 1 1 0 3 3 3 2 3.56 715/994 3.56 4.04 3.94 3.96 3.56 Laboratory  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/278 **** 2.75 4.19 4.24 *** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/260 **** **** 4.46 4.49 *** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 10 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/259 **** **** 4.33 4.33 ***  Seminar  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 101 **** 4.69 4.48 4.30 *** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 99 **** 4.33 4.39 4.29 *** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.27 4.14 3.48 ***  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 76 **** 2.75 3.98 4.03 *** 4.00	-														3.90
Laboratory  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 278 **** 2.75 4.19 4.24 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 259 **** **** 4.46 4.49 ****  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 10 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 259 **** **** 4.33 4.33 ***  Seminar  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 101 **** 4.69 4.48 4.30 ***  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.27 4.14 3.48 ***  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 76 **** 2.75 3.98 4.03 ***  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 9 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 77 **** **** 3.93 3.70 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 9 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.45 3.87 ***			-	-		_	_	-		,					4.30
Laboratory  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 278 **** 2.75 4.19 4.24 ***  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 260 **** **** 4.46 4.49 ***  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 10 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 259 **** **** 4.33 4.33 ***  Seminar  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 101 **** 4.69 4.48 4.30 ***  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 99 **** 4.33 4.39 4.29 ***  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.27 4.14 3.48 ***  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 76 **** 2.75 3.98 4.03 ***  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 9 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 77 **** **** 3.93 3.70 ***  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 9 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.45 3.87 ***										. , .					
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 278 **** 2.75 4.19 4.24 *** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 260 **** **** 4.46 4.49 *** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 10 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 259 **** **** 4.33 4.33 ***  Seminar  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 101 **** 4.69 4.48 4.30 *** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 99 **** 4.33 4.39 4.29 *** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	4. Were special techniques successful	1	Τ	Τ	0	3	3	2	3.56	715/ 994	3.56	4.04	3.94	3.96	3.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 260 **** **** 4.46 4.49 *** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 10 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 259 **** **** 4.33 4.33 ***  Seminar  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 101 **** 4.69 4.48 4.30 ***  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 99 **** 4.33 4.39 4.29 ***  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.27 4.14 3.48 ***  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 76 **** 2.75 3.98 4.03 ***  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 9 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 77 **** **** 3.93 3.70 ***  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 9 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.45 3.87 ***															
Seminar  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 259 **** **** 4.33 4.33 ***  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 101 **** 4.69 4.48 4.30 ***  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 99 **** 4.33 4.39 4.29 ***  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 76 **** 2.75 3.98 4.03 ***  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 9 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 77 **** **** 3.93 3.70 ***  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 9 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.45 3.87 ***			-		-		-	-		,	****				****
Seminar  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 101 **** 4.69 4.48 4.30 ***  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 99 **** 4.33 4.39 4.29 ***  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.27 4.14 3.48 ***  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 76 **** 2.75 3.98 4.03 ***  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 9 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 77 **** **** 3.93 3.70 ***  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 9 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.45 3.87 ***	<u>.</u>		-	_	-	-	•	•			****				
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 101 **** 4.69 4.48 4.30 *** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 99 **** 4.33 4.39 4.29 *** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.27 4.14 3.48 ***  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 76 **** 2.75 3.98 4.03 *** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 9 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 77 **** **** 3.93 3.70 *** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 9 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.45 3.87 ***	4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	Τ	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 99 **** 4.33 4.39 4.29 *** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.27 4.14 3.48 ***  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 76 **** 2.75 3.98 4.03 ***  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 9 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 77 **** **** 3.93 3.70 ***  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 9 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.45 3.87 ***						_									
5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.27 4.14 3.48 ***  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 76 **** 2.75 3.98 4.03 ***  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 9 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 77 **** **** 3.93 3.70 ***  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 9 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.45 3.87 ***			-	-		-	-	-		,					
Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 76 **** 2.75 3.98 4.03 ***  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 9 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 77 **** **** 3.93 3.70 ***  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 9 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.45 3.87 ***	-							-		,					
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 76 **** 2.75 3.98 4.03 *** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 9 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 77 **** **** 3.93 3.70 *** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 9 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.45 3.87 ***	5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	U	1	U	U	U	U	1.00	***/ 9/	***	4.2/	4.14	3.48	^ ^ ^ ^
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 9 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 77 **** **** 3.93 3.70 *** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 9 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.45 3.87 ***															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 9 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.45 3.87 ***			0		0	_	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	2.75	3.98	4.03	****
		-	-	_	-	_	-	-							***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 9 1 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.12 3.67 ***							-	-		,					****
	4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****
Self Paced												= 0.5	4 05		
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 61 **** 5.00 4.09 3.20 ***	1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	3.20	****
Frequency Distribution	Frequ	lency	Dist	crib	ution	n									

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	L.	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	0	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	3	Under-grad	10	Non-major	3	
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	-4.00 3 F 0 Electiv		Electives	2	#### - Means	## - Means there are not enou				
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant		
				I	0	Other	2	-	_			

? 2

Course-Section: ART 424 0101

Title CONTEMP ART, THEORY, CR

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 18

JACOB, PREMINDA 19 Fall 2005

Page 127 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	Frequencies				Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	406/1674	4.67	4.32	4.27	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	153/1674	4.89	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	431/1423	4.63	4.27	4.27	4.34	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2		4.67	312/1609	4.67	4.34	4.22	4.30	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61		4.61	3.79	3.96	4.01	4.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44		4.44	3.68	4.08	4.18	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	4	13	4.56	458/1651		3.83	4.18	4.23	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	123/1656	4.87	4.00	4.07	4.19	4.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	266/1586	4.88	4.29	4.43	4.46	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.76	4.69		5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	313/1582	4.75	4.27	4.26	4.31	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	268/1575	4.81	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	110/1380	4.81	4.34	3.94	4.04	4.81	
1															
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	259/1520	4.71	4.17	4.01	4.18	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	348/1515	4.79	4.52	4.24	4.40	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	195/1511	4.93	4.53	4.27	4.45	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	178/ 994	4.57	4.04	3.94	4.19	4.57	
T - N +															
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	++++/ 265	++++	****	4.23	4.53	****	
9		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****		4.23		****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17 17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 278 ****/ 260	****	2.75	4.19	4.21 4.24	****	
	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 259	***	****	4.40	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1/	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	***/ 259			4.33	4.31		
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	42/ 103	4.75	4.51	4.41	4.42	4.75	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	2	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	69/ 101	4.33	4.69	4.48	4.65	4.33	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	2	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	43/ 95	4.50	4.50	4.31	4.60	4.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	70/ 99	4.00	4.33	4.39	4.57	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	42/ 97	4.38	4.27	4.14	4.46	4.38	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.75	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 77	***	2./5 ****	3.90	4.24	***	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****		4.24	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.45 4.12	4.86	****	
4. 10 what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1/	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	/ 40			4.12	4.13		
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ART 424 0101

Title CONTEMP ART, THEORY, CR

Instructor:

JACOB, PREMINDA

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 127 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	GPA Expected Grades			Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	18	Non-major	1
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	nificant		
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 425 0101 University of Maryland

WRIT BY & ABOUT ARTIST Baltimore County

Title WRIT BY & ABC Instructor: SPITZ, ELLEN

Enrollment: 7
Questionnaires: 7

Fall 2005

Page 128

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
--	---------	--------	------------	---------------

			Frequencies			3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions				2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	1	1	2 22	1563/1674	3.33	4.32	4.27	4.42	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	7	0		1559/1674		4.23	4.27	4.42	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	1	2		1016/1423		4.23	4.23	4.34	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	0	2		1452/1609	3.50	4.34	4.22	4.30	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.17	642/1585	4.17	3.79	3.96	4.30	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	1	0		. ,		3.68	4.08	4.18	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	1	0	0	1	0		1435/1535 1324/1651		3.83	4.08	4.18	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	2		1361/1673				4.23	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.33	955/1656		4.65 4.00	4.69 4.07		4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	U	U	U	2	Τ	4	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.00	4.07	4.19	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1300/1586	4.00	4.29	4.43	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	811/1585	4.80	4.76	4.69	4.76	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	998/1582		4.27	4.26	4.31	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	1	1		1402/1575		4.23	4.27	4.35	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	666/1380		4.34	3.94	4.04	4.00
5. Più addiovipadi cocimitades cimanos fodi anacipadialing	_	ŭ	Ū	ŭ	_		_	1.00	000, 2000	1.00	1.51	3.71	1.01	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned			0	0	2	2	2	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.17	4.01	4.18	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	289/1515	4.83	4.52	4.24	4.40	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	323/1511	4.83	4.53	4.27	4.45	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	676/ 994	3.67	4.04	3.94	4.19	3.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	1	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	103/ 103	2.33	4.51	4.41	4.42	2.33
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	55/ 101	4.50	4.69	4.48	4.65	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	76/ 95	3.67	4.50	4.31	4.60	3.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	70/ 99	4.00	4.33	4.39	4.57	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	50/ 97	4.00	4.27	4.14	4.46	4.00
Frequ	encv	Dist	rib	utio	ı									

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

Course-Section: ART 429A 0101

ISSUES BLACK, QUEER & F

Title Instructor: SMALLS, JAMES

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 8

Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 129 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	Ο	Ο	7	4.63	458/1674	4.63	4.32	4.27	4.42	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	776/1674	4.38	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	0	0	1		1268/1423	3.50	4.27	4.27	4.34	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	852/1609	4.25	4.34	4.22	4.30	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	326/1585	4.50	3.79	3.96	4.01	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	310/1535		3.68	4.08	4.18	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	2	4		1097/1651		3.83	4.18	4.23	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	4		1155/1673	4.57	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	827/1656	4.17	4.00	4.07	4.19	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	0	4	4 33	1074/1586	4.33	4.29	4.43	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	4		1074/1585		4.76	4.69	4.76	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	. ,		4.70	4.26	4.70	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	886/1575		4.23	4.27	4.35	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	259/1380			3.94	4.04	
5. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding		U	U	U		_	5	4.57	259/1360	4.57	4.34	3.94	4.04	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	397/1520	4.50	4.17	4.01	4.18	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	242/1515	4.88	4.52	4.24	4.40	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	642/1511		4.53	4.27	4.45	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	4.04	3.94	4.19	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	48/ 103	4.67	4.51	4.41	4.42	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	4.69	4.48	4.65	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	38/ 95	4.67	4.50	4.31	4.60	4.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	44/ 99	4.67	4.33	4.39	4.57	4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	34/ 97	4.67	4.27	4.14	4.46	4.67
Post 100		D												

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

Course-Section: ART 430 0101

Title GRAPHIC DESIGN VI

Instructor: RE, PEGGY

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 16

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 130 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean			Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	298/1674	4 75	4.32	4.27	4.42	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	379/1674		4.23	4.23	4.31	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	9	0	0	0	0	3			****	4.27	4.27	4.34	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82			4.34	4.22	4.30	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	6	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	121/1585	4.83	3.79	3.96	4.01	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	1	2	9	4.67			3.68	4.08	4.18	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	5	2	-		1324/1651		3.83	4.18	4.23	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	4	8		1072/1673		4.65	4.69	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80			4.00	4.07	4.19	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.29	4.43	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	286/1582		4.27	4.26	4.31	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	453/1575		4.23	4.27	4.35	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	6	0	0	0	1	2		****/1380			3.94	4.04	****
Discussion	_	•	0	0	-	_	_	4 55	252/1500	4 55	4 1 1	4 01	4 10	4 55
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.55	373/1520		4.17	4.01	4.18	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	207/1515	4.91	4.52	4.24	4.40	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5 5	0 5	0	0	0	1	10 3	4.91	244/1511		4.53	4.27	4.45	4.91 4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	U	U	U	3	3	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	4.04	3.94	4.19	4.50
Laboratory		_	_											
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	2.75	4.19	4.21	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.69	4.48	4.65	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99		4.33	4.39	4.57	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	***	4.27	4.14	4.46	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.75	3.98	4.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.13	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	***	****	4.27	4.48	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52		4.00	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	5.00	****

Course-Section: ART 430 0101

Title GRAPHIC DESIGN VI

Instructor: RE, PEGGY

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 16

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 130 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2005

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 11

12

Course-Section: ART 431 0101 University of Maryland Page 131 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN VII JAN 21, 2006 Instructor: STANLEY, RICHAR Job IRBR3029

					Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	insights, skills fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	928/1674	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.42	4.27
	or make clear the ex		0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	657/1674	4.34	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.45
	estions reflect the e		0	7	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	1268/1423	3.50	4.27	4.27	4.34	3.50
4. Did other evalua	tions reflect the ex	pected goals	0	1	0	2	0	3	5	4.10	1029/1609	4.32	4.34	4.22	4.30	4.10
	dings contribute to		1	4	0	3	1	0	2	3.17	1400/1585	3.40	3.79	3.96	4.01	3.17
6. Did written assi	gnments contribute t	o what you learned	1	3	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	1066/1535	4.03	3.68	4.08	4.18	3.86
7. Was the grading	system clearly expla	ined	1	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	934/1651	3.60	3.83	4.18	4.23	4.20
	as class cancelled		1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1135/1673	4.61	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.60
9. How would you gr	ade the overall tead	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	849/1656	4.24	4.00	4.07	4.19	4.14
1 77 12	Lecture		1	0	0	^	0	1	-	4 50	050/1506	4 40	4 00	4 42	1 10	4 50
	tor's lectures well		1	0	0	0	2	Ţ	7	4.50	858/1586	4.40	4.29	4.43	4.46	4.50
	or seem interested i	•	1	0	0	0	Ţ	2	7		1142/1585	4.80	4.76	4.69	4.76	4.60
	rial presented and e	-	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	777/1582	4.30	4.27	4.26	4.31	4.40
	contribute to what	-	1	0	0	2	Τ	Ţ	6		1100/1575	4.20	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.10
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance y	our understanding	Τ	Τ	0	Τ	2	1	5	4.11	612/1380	3.87	4.34	3.94	4.04	4.11
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	sions contribute to	what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	1	5	4.00	810/1520	4.11	4.17	4.01	4.18	4.00
2. Were all student	s actively encourage	d to participate	2	0	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	707/1515	4.50	4.52	4.24	4.40	4.44
3. Did the instruct	or encourage fair an	d open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	707/1511	4.50	4.53	4.27	4.45	4.44
4. Were special tec	hniques successful	_	2	3	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	600/ 994	4.00	4.04	3.94	4.19	3.83
		Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
		_														
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10	_			
				2	Ω						

Course-Section: ART 431 0201

Title GRAPHIC DESIGN VII

Instructor: ABRAHAM, GUENET

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 14

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 132 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equen 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean			Sect Mean
General			_		_		_							
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	891/1674		4.32	4.27	4.42	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	0	4	7	4.23	956/1674	4.34	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	0	0	1 7		****/1423	3.50	4.27	4.27	4.34	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1 3	2	0	0 3	1	3 2	3	4.55	443/1609 1149/1585	4.32	4.34 3.79	4.22	4.30 4.01	4.55 3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3 7	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	737/1535	4.03	3.79	4.08	4.01	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	4	3	0	2	2			1562/1651	3.60	3.83	4.18	4.10	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	8		1124/1673	4.61	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	5		615/1656		4.00	4.07	4.19	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	3	5	4 30	1104/1586	4.40	4.29	4.43	4.46	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1585	4.80	4.76	4.69	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	998/1582	4.30	4.27	4.26	4.31	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	915/1575	4.20	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	986/1380	3.87			4.04	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	673/1520	4.11	4.17	4.01	4.18	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	586/1515	4.50	4.52	4.24	4.40	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	602/1511	4.50	4.53	4.27	4.45	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	408/ 994		4.04		4.19	4.17
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.53	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	2.75	4.19	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.31	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	***	****	4.20	4.10	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.51	4.41	4.42	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.69	4.48	4.65	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.33	4.39	4.57	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.27	4.14	4.46	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	2.75	3.98	4.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.13	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.48	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 52	****	4.00	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	5.00	****

Course-Section: ART 431 0201
Title GRAPHIC DESIGN VII

Instructor: ABRAHAM, GUENET

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 132 JAN 21, 2006 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	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ι
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Page 133
Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	13	
Questionnaires:	13	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

Course-Section: ART 435A 0101

REPRESENTATION

STURGEON, JOHN

Title

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

Instructor:

							Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	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 you	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	3	0	0	0	3	7	0	3.70	1429/1674	3.70	4.32	4.27	4.42	3.70
_	_	ctor make clear			3	0	0	0	6	2	2	3.60	1451/1674	3.60	4.23	4.23	4.31	3.60
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	3	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.34	****
4. Did oth	ner evalı	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	3	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	743/1609	4.33	4.34	4.22	4.30	4.33
				what you learned	3	0	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1297/1585	3.40	3.79	3.96	4.01	3.40
6. Did wri	tten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	3	4	1	1	0	4	0	3.17	1414/1535	3.17	3.68	4.08	4.18	3.17
	-	g system clearl		ained	3	1	0	2	2	3	2		1422/1651	3.56	3.83	4.18	4.23	3.56
	-	was class canc			3	0	0	0	0	5	5		1203/1673		4.65	4.69	4.67	4.50
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1162/1656	3.86	4.00	4.07	4.19	3.86
		Lectur	2															
1. Were th	ne instri	actor's lecture		prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	663/1586	4.67	4.29	4.43	4.46	4.67
		ctor seem inter			4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1585		4.76	4.69	4.76	5.00
				explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	438/1582		4.27	4.26	4.31	4.67
		es contribute t			4	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	768/1575		4.23	4.27	4.35	4.44
				your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	86/1380		4.34	3.94	4.04	4.89
		Discus				_		_		_								
				what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	4		673/1520		4.17	4.01	4.18	4.22
		-	_	ed to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	384/1515		4.52	4.24	4.40	4.75
		_		nd open discussion	4	0 8	0	0 1	1	2	6	4.56	602/1511 ****/ 994		4.53	4.27	4.45	4.56
4. were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	SSIUI		4	8	U	Т	U	U	U	2.00	***/ 994		4.04	3.94	4.19	* * * *
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ation	ı									
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re:	ason	a			Ту	ne			Majors	•
CIECILS Ed				Expedied Grades						ə 				 he				, . – – – –
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors		0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 7														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	3	Non-	major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														

Electives

Other

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

#### Course-Section: ART 447 0101 University of Maryland Title 2D ANIMATION/COMPOSITI Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006

Instructor: DYER, ERIK G

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 12

		Fall		-1
Student	Course	Evalua	tion	Ouestionnaire

Page 134

Job IRBR3029

							Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	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 yo	ou gain n	new insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	1056/1674	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.42	4.17
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	7	1	4	3.75	1370/1674	4.03	4.23	4.23	4.31	3.75
3. Did th	ne exam q	questions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	376/1423	4.67	4.27	4.27	4.34	4.67
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	1	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	1094/1609	4.14	4.34	4.22	4.30	4.00
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	2	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	907/1585	3.70	3.79	3.96	4.01	3.90
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1535	****	3.68	4.08	4.18	****
7. Was th	ne gradin	ng system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	4	2	2	2	2	2.67	1604/1651	3.22	3.83	4.18	4.23	2.67
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	635/1673	4.96	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.92
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1222/1656	3.56	4.00	4.07	4.19	3.78
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	1	6	1	4	3.67	1442/1586	3.55	4.29	4.43	4.46	3.67
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	1434/1585	4.30	4.76	4.69	4.76	4.17
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	1	4	3.73	1320/1582	3.72	4.27	4.26	4.31	3.73
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	2	3	3	4	3.75	1289/1575	3.80	4.23	4.27	4.35	3.75
5. Did au	ıdiovisua	al techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	1	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	626/1380	4.33	4.34	3.94	4.04	4.09
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.17	4.01	4.18	4.00
2. Were a	all stude	ents actively en	courage	ed to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	432/1515	4.71	4.52	4.24	4.40	4.71
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	586/1511	4.57	4.53	4.27	4.45	4.57
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful		5	3	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	638/ 994	3.75	4.04	3.94	4.19	3.75
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	larned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 7		Per	anir		or Ma			0	 Graduat		0	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3		1/6/	4urr,	cu I	OT MG	בטנ ג	D	J	Graduat	_	J	Ma JC	) <u>+</u>	U
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	.2	Non-	-major	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		061	c.a	_				J	onaci -g	Luu I		14011		_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		E14	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### - :	Means +	here a	re not	enous	rh
Jiaa.	O	3.30 1.00	5	P 0		11.1	CCCI	v C D				J	respons				_	111

Other

I 0

?

2

12

Course-Section: ART 447 0201

Title 2D ANIMATION/COMPOSITI

Instructor: DYER, ERIK G

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 10

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 135 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	891/1674				4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	870/1674		4.23	4.23	4.31	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	376/1423		4.27	4.27	4.34	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	812/1609	4.14	4.34	4.22	4.30	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	1	3		1223/1585		3.79	3.96	4.01	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	1		****/1535		3.68	4.08	4.18	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	5	1	3	3.78	1310/1651	3.22	3.83	4.18	4.23	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1673	4.96	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	1444/1656	3.56	4.00	4.07	4.19	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	3	0		1495/1586			4.43	4.46	3.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	3		1292/1585		4.76	4.69	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	5	0		1326/1582		4.27	4.26	4.31	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1240/1575	3.80	4.23	4.27	4.35	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	259/1380	4.33	4.34	3.94	4.04	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/1520	4.00	4.17	4.01	4.18	****
	9	0	0	0	-	0	1		****/1515		4.52			****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1515			4.24	4.40	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	~~~/1511	4.5/	4.53	4.2/	4.45	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	2.75	3.98	4.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	4.24	****

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

Course-Section: ART 456 0101

Title PHOTO SENIOR THESIS I

Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN

Enrollment: 12
Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 136 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1385/1674	3.80	4.32	4.27	4.42	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	1077/1674	4.10	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	786/1609	4.30	4.34	4.22	4.30	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	5	2	1	3.10	1423/1585	3.10	3.79	3.96	4.01	3.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	2	4	1	3.33	1355/1535	3.33	3.68	4.08	4.18	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	3	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	3.83	4.18	4.23	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	887/1673	4.80	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.00	4.07	4.19	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	1144/1586	4.25	4.29	4.43	4.46	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	0	1	6		1328/1585	4.38	4.76	4.69	4.76	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	935/1582		4.27	4.26	4.31	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	1080/1575	4.13	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	399/1380	4.38	4.34	3.94	4.04	4.38
<b>-</b> 1														
Discussion	0	0	^	0	0	_	0	4 00	101/1500	4 00	4 1 7	4 01	4 10	4 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	8 10	4.80	191/1520	4.80	4.17	4.01	4.18 4.40	4.80
<ol> <li>Were all students actively encouraged to participate</li> <li>Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion</li> </ol>	2	0	0	0	0	0 1	J 0	5.00	1/1515 244/1511	5.00 4.90	4.52 4.53	4.24	4.40	5.00 4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	2 2	9	1	0	0	Τ	9		****/ 994		4.53	3.94	4.45	4.90
4. Were special techniques successiui	4	9	Τ	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 994		4.04	3.94	4.19	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.51	4.41	4.42	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.69	4.48	4.65	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.33	4.39	4.57	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.27	4.14	4.46	****

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

Course-Section: ART 480 0101 University of Maryland Title HIST/THEORY IMAGING

?

0

Instructor: MAHONEY, JAMES Enrollment: 11 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questionnaires: 11

University of Ma	aryland	Page	137
Baltimore Cou	unty JAN	1 21,	2006
Fall 200	Joh	IRBF	3029

						Frequencies						Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did	. coin no	Genera w insights,ski	-	m this source	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	687/1674	4.28	1 22	1 27	1 12	4.45
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	0	1	3	6		1009/1674		4.32	4.27	4.42 4.31	4.45
		estions reflec			0	9	0	0	0	0	2		****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.34	****
		ations reflect			0	2	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	202/1609	4.39	4.34	4.22	4.30	4.78
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80		4.60	3.79	3.96	4.01	4.80
				o what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	215/1535	4.30	3.68	4.08	4.18	4.70
		system clearl			1	1	0	0	1	3	5		613/1651	3.92	3.83	4.18	4.23	4.44
		was class cand			1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	706/1673	4.65	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.90
				ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	,		4.00	4.07	4.19	4.80
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture		prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	214/1586	4.64	4.29	4.43	4.46	4.90
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.76	5.00
		explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	170/1582	4.57	4.27	4.26	4.31	4.89		
		you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	279/1575	4.59	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.80		
		our understanding	1	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	303/1380		4.34	3.94	4.04	4.50		
		Discus																
1. Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.17	4.01	4.18	5.00
				ed to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.52	4.24	4.40	5.00
				nd open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.53	4.27	4.45	5.00
		echniques succe			3	1	1	1	0	0	5	4.00	474/ 994		4.04	3.94	4.19	4.00
		Semina	r															
1. Were as	ssigned t			announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.51	4.41	4.42	****
				lividual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 101	****	4.69	4.48	4.65	****
				what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	4.60	****
	_	ons contribute		_	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.33	4.39	4.57	****
		or grading mad			10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.27	4.14	4.46	****
		Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n											
O				Dar					m				Ma =	_				
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				кеа	asons				Ту]	pe 			Majors 				
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 10						Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55 56-83	0 1	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0 2	B 0 C 0		Gei	nerai	1				2	Under-q	rad 1	L1	Non-	-major	1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D 0								-	onaci g.			1,011		_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Electives						0	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0								•	respons	es to b	oe sign	nifican	nt	
				I 0		Ot]	her					8						

Course-Section: ART 480 0201 Universit
Title HIST/THEORY IMAGING Baltin

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2005

Instructor: MAHONEY, JAMES

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 10

Page 138 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

<b>-</b>				
Ctudant	('Ollred	Evaluation	Ougetion	ם אינ כמו

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	-	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1 Did you	gain ne	w insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	1	0	1	3	5	4 10	1115/1674	4.28	4.32	4.27	4.42	4.10
		tor make clear			0	0	1	0	4	1	4		1401/1674		4.23	4.23	4.31	3.70
		ations reflect			0	3	0	0	2	3	2		1094/1609	4.39	4.34	4.22	4.30	4.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	413/1585	4.60	3.79	3.96	4.01	4.40
				o what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	1022/1535	4.30	3.68	4.08	4.18	3.90
7. Was the	grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	1	4	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1485/1651	3.92	3.83	4.18	4.23	3.40
8. How many	times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1311/1673	4.65	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.40
9. How woul	ld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	719/1656	4.53	4.00	4.07	4.19	4.25
		Lectur	e															
1. Were the	re the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1034/1586	4.64	4.29	4.43	4.46	4.38
	id the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.76	5.00
	s lecture material presented and explained clea d the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	1	4	3		935/1582		4.27	4.26	4.31	4.25
	the lectures contribute to what you learned				2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	847/1575	4.59	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.38
5. Did audi	id audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	603/1380	4.31	4.34	3.94	4.04	4.13
	Discussion																	
1. Did clas	ss discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.17	4.01	4.18	5.00
				d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.52	4.24	4.40	5.00
				d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1511		4.53	4.27	4.45	5.00
4. Were spe	ecial te	chniques succe	ssful		5	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	115/ 994	4.38	4.04	3.94	4.19	4.75
		Semina	r															
				announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.51	4.41	4.42	****
_		ns contribute		-	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.33	4.39	4.57	****
5. Were cri	lteria f	or grading mad	e clear		8	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	4.27	4.14	4.46	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	crib	utio	n									
Credits Ear	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	Reasons								Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 0	A 8		Red	ed f	or Ma	ior	 s	 1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1	Required for Major						_	_	Gradat	_	•	114.50	-	J
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General						5	Under-q	rad 1	.0	Non-	major	0	
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	General								5				3	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Electives						0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	<sub>j</sub> h
				P 0		110001100							respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner					5						

1

Course-Section: ART 484 0101

Title ADVANCED 3D ANIMATION

Instructor: BAILEY, DAN

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 10 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 139 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions		NR	NA	Fre	equen 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this co	urge	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	243/1674	4 80	4.32	4.27	4.42	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected go		0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	138/1674	4.90	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected go		1	4	0	1	0	3	1		1155/1423	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.34	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected go		0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	282/1609	4.70	4.34	4.22	4.30	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you		0	8	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1585	****	3.79	3.96	4.01	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you		0	6	1	0	1	1	1		1386/1535	3.25	3.68	4.08	4.18	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		0	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	524/1651	4.50	3.83	4.18	4.23	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled		1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	929/1673	4.78	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effect	ctiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	127/1656	4.86	4.00	4.07	4.19	4.86
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared		0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	389/1586	4.80	4.29	4.43	4.46	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the sub	ject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained	clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	394/1582	4.70	4.27	4.26	4.31	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	ed	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	915/1575	4.30	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your unders	standing	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	114/1380	4.80	4.34	3.94	4.04	4.80
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you		6	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	645/1520	4.25	4.17	4.01	4.18	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to part:	_	6	0	0	1	0	1	2		1024/1515	4.00	4.52	4.24	4.40	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open dis	scussion	6	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1221/1511	3.75	4.53	4.27	4.45	3.75
Laboratory						•	_	•							****
2. Were you provided with adequate background in:		9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	2.75	4.19	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab act	tivities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance		9	U	0	0	U	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.31	****
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced		9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 103	****	4.51	4.41	4.42	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual at		9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.69	4.48	4.65	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learn	ned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.33	4.39	4.57	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear		9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.27	4.14	4.46	****
Field Work	_		_	_	_		_	_							
1. Did field experience contribute to what you le		9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.75	3.98	4.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation cr		9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	4.24	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activ	vities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.48	****
	Freque	ncy	Dist	ribu	tion	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expecte	ed Grades				Rea	sons				Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A	7		 Reo	uire	d fo	or Ma	jors	 3	 1	Graduate	 e	0	 Majo	 r	0
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B	2						-						3 -		
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 2 C	1		Gen	eral					1	Under-g	rad 1	0	Non-	major	0
84-150 6 3.00-3.49 2 D	0														
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F	0	Electives							0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
P	0									response	es to b	e sign	ifican	t	
I	0	Other							9						

## Course-Section: ART 486 0101 University of Maryland ADVANCED INTERACTIVITY

Ρ

I

?

0

0

Title Baltimore County Instructor: REINSEL, JOSEPH Fall 2005

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 8 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

3.50-4.00

Grad.

0

Questions	NR	NA	Fr 1	equer 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	2	2	0	1	2.67	1656/1674	2.67	4.32	4.27	4.42	2.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	2	1	0	2		1608/1674	3.00	4.23	4.23	4.31	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	575/1423	4.50	4.27	4.27	4.34	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1377/1609	3.67	4.34	4.22	4.30	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	1572/1585	2.00	3.79	3.96	4.01	2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1435/1535	3.00	3.68	4.08	4.18	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	3	1	0	0	1	2.00	1636/1651	2.00	3.83	4.18	4.23	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1135/1673	4.60	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1540/1656	3.00	4.00	4.07	4.19	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	3	1	0	1	2.80	1559/1586	2.80	4.29	4.43	4.46	2.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1309/1585	4.40	4.76	4.69	4.76	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	1	0	1	2.80	1543/1582	2.80	4.27	4.26	4.31	2.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	1562/1575	2.00	4.23	4.27	4.35	2.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	902/1380	3.75	4.34	3.94	4.04	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	1	0	1	2 60	1465/1520	2.60	4.17	4.01	4.18	2.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	1	0	3		1180/1515		4.52	4.24	4.40	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	0	1	3		1050/1511		4.53	4.27	4.45	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	881/ 994		4.04	3.94	4.19	3.00
To a control of the c		- D												
Frequ	lency	DIS	trib	utioi	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	3			Ty	pe			Majors	}
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2		Red	guir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors		1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3			-											
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 1		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	3
84-150 4 3.00-3.49 2 D 0														

Electives

5

Other

Page 140

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

## Course-Section: ART 487 0101 University of Maryland Title EXPERIMENTAL INTERFACE Baltimore County Fall 2005

Instructor: REINSEL, JOSEPH

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 141

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	768/1674	4.40	4.32	4.27	4.42	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1340/1674	3.80	4.23	4.23	4.31	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.34	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1320/1609	3.75	4.34	4.22	4.30	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	0	1	0	0	1.50	1582/1585	1.50	3.79	3.96	4.01	1.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1524/1535	2.00	3.68	4.08	4.18	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	2	1	1	0		1599/1651	2.75	3.83	4.18	4.23	2.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	0		1566/1673	4.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1377/1656	3.50	4.00	4.07	4.19	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1480/1586	3.50	4.29	4.43	4.46	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	917/1585	4.75	4.76	4.69	4.76	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1504/1582	3.00	4.27	4.26	4.31	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	1445/1575	3.25	4.23	4.27	4.35	3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	666/1380	4.00	4.34	3.94	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1252/1520	3.33	4.17	4.01	4.18	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	483/1515		4.52	4.24	4.40	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	816/1511	4.33	4.53	4.27	4.45	4.33

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

### Course-Section: ART 491 0110 University of Maryland Page 142 Title SPECIAL STUDIES Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Fall 2005 O'DELL, KATHY (Instr. A)

Instructor: Enrollment: 0

Questionnaires: 1

Student	Course	Evaluation	on Quest:	lonnaire
---------	--------	------------	-----------	----------

			Frequencies			Instructor			Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions		NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1363/1423	3.00	4.27	4.27	4.34	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.34	4.22	4.30	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1440/1585	3.00	3.79	3.96	4.01	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1435/1535	3.00	3.68	4.08	4.18	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1566/1673	4.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1540/1656	3.00	4.00	4.07	4.19	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1539/1586	3.00	4.29	4.43	4.46	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1574/1585	3.00	4.76	4.69	4.76	3.00

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

## Course-Section: ART 491 0110 University of Maryland Page 143 JAN 21, 2006

Title SPECIAL STUDIES Baltimore County (Instr. B) Fall 2005 Instructor: Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	0	
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies				Instructor			Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1363/1423	3.00	4.27	4.27	4.34	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.34	4.22	4.30	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1440/1585	3.00	3.79	3.96	4.01	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1435/1535	3.00	3.68	4.08	4.18	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1566/1673	4.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1539/1586	3.00	4.29	4.43	4.46	3.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1504/1582	3.00	4.27	4.26	4.31	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1487/1575	3.00	4.23	4.27	4.35	3.00

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

## Course-Section: ART 491 0110 University of Maryland Page 144

Title SPECIAL STUDIES Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 0

Questionnaires: 1	Student	Course	${\tt Evaluation}$	Questionnaire
-------------------	---------	--------	--------------------	---------------

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1363/1423	3.00	4.27	4.27	4.34	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.34	4.22	4.30	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1440/1585	3.00	3.79	3.96	4.01	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1435/1535	3.00	3.68	4.08	4.18	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1566/1673	4.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1539/1586	3.00	4.29	4.43	4.46	3.00

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

## Course-Section: ART 491 0110 University of Maryland Page 145 Title

SPECIAL STUDIES Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 (Instr. D) Instructor: Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	0			
Ouestionnaires:	1	Student Course	e Evaluation Ouestionnaire	

		Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1363/1423	3.00	4.27	4.27	4.34	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.34	4.22	4.30	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1440/1585	3.00	3.79	3.96	4.01	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1435/1535	3.00	3.68	4.08	4.18	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1566/1673	4.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1539/1586	3.00	4.29	4.43	4.46	3.00

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

Course-Section: ART 494 0115	University of Maryland	Page 146
Title INTERNSHIP	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: RE, PEGGY	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029

	,	
Enrollment:	3	
Questionnaires:	3	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies							Instr	uctor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.23	4.23	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.34	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	4.50	4.00	4.07	4.19	5.00

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

Course-Section:	ART 494 0120	University of Maryland	Page 147
Title	INTERNSHIP	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:	CHAN, IRENE	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029

FIII OI I MEHC.					
Ouestionnaires:	1	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

		Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.23	4.23	4.31	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1535	5.00	3.68	4.08	4.18	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	3.83	4.18	4.23	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	955/1656	4.50	4.00	4.07	4.19	4.00

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

 Course-Section:
 ART
 494
 0130
 University of Maryland
 Page
 148

 Title
 INTERNSHIP
 Baltimore County
 JAN 21, 2006

 Instructor:
 CAZABON, LYNN
 Fall
 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 1
Questionnaires: 1 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Course-Section: ART 495 0103 University of Maryland Page 149
Title INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: STAFF Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: STAFF
Enrollment: 2
Questionnaires: 2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

#### Course-Section: ART 495 0129 University of Maryland Page 150 Title INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006

CHAN, IRENE Instructor:

Enrollment: 1 Questionnaires: 1

# Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies			Instructor			Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.23	4.23	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.34	4.22	4.30	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	3.79	3.96	4.01	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1535	5.00	3.68	4.08	4.18	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1562/1651	4.00	3.83	4.18	4.23	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	4.75	4.00	4.07	4.19	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.17	4.01	4.18	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.52	4.24	4.40	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.53	4.27	4.45	5.00

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

#### Course-Section: ART 495 0146 University of Maryland Page 151 Title INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: WORDEN, FRED

Enrollment: 2

Questionnaires: 2 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.23	4.23	4.31	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.27	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.34	4.22	4.30	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	3.79	3.96	4.01	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1535	5.00	3.68	4.08	4.18	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	4.00	3.83	4.18	4.23	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	381/1656	4.75	4.00	4.07	4.19	4.50

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

Course-Section: ART 610 0101

Title IMAG. DIGITAL SEMINAR

Instructor: NOHE, TIM

Enrollment: 5

Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 152 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	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	0	1	4	4.80	243/1674	4.80	4.32	4.27	4.44	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	215/1674	4.80	4.23	4.23	4.34	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.27	4.27	4.28	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.34	4.22	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	136/1585	4.80	3.79	3.96	4.23	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	373/1535	4.50	3.68	4.08	4.27	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	524/1651	4.50	3.83	4.18	4.32	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.78	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	381/1656	4.50		4.07	4.15	4.50
. 3														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.29	4.43	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.27	4.26	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.30	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1380	5.00			3.85	5.00
1 1 1									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	295/1520	4.67	4.17	4.01	4.19	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.52	4.24	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	507/1511	4.67	4.53	4.27	4.49	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	322/ 994	4.33	4.04	3.94	4.07	4.33
1									,					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.51	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	2.75	4.19	4.42	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.67	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.66	****
									,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 103	5.00	4.51	4.41	4.56	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	4.69	4.48	4.62	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 95	5.00	4.50	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 99	5.00	4.33	4.39	4.54	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.27	4.14	4.26	5.00
									,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.75	3.98	4.20	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.46	****
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	4.64	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	4.84	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Course-Section: ART 610 0101

Title IMAG. DIGITAL SEMINAR

Instructor: NOHE, TIM

Enrollment:

5 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Page 152 Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

University of Maryland Page 153
Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ART 620 0101

5

HIST I&D ARTS

MAHONEY, JAMES

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 4

O control on a							Fr	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	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 you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	-	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.44	5.00
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.23	4.23	4.34	5.00
		estions reflec			0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.27	4.27	4.28	5.00
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.34	4.22	4.34	5.00
5. Did as	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	3.79	3.96	4.23	5.00
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute 1	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1535	5.00	3.68	4.08	4.27	5.00
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	524/1651	4.50	3.83	4.18	4.32	4.50
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	958/1673	4.75	4.65	4.69	4.78	4.75
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa	.ll tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	257/1656	4.67	4.00	4.07	4.15	4.67
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.29	4.43	4.50	5.00
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested :	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	d and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.27	4.26	4.33	5.00
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.30	5.00
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1380	4.75	4.34	3.94	3.85	4.75
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	229/1520	4.75	4.17	4.01	4.19	4.75
2. Were a	ll studen	ts actively en	courage	ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.52	4.24	4.47	5.00
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.53	4.27	4.49	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	4.04	3.94	4.07	5.00
		Semina	r															
1. Were as	ssigned t	opics relevant	to the	e announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 103	5.00	4.51	4.41	4.56	5.00
2. Was the	e instruc	tor available	for ind	dividual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	4.69	4.48	4.62	5.00
3. Did res	search pr	ojects contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 95	5.00	4.50	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did pre	esentatio	ns contribute	to what	t you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 99	5.00	4.33	4.39	4.54	5.00
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading mad	le clear	r	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.27	4.14	4.26	5.00
				Frequ	ency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	 2	0.00-0.99	0	A 2			 quir		 or Mo	ior		0	Graduat		 0	 Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	A 2 B 0		RΕ	:quir	ea I	or Ma	Jor	5	U	Graduati	E	U	Ma JC	JΤ	U
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	-major	0
84-150 Grad.	0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	0	D 0 F 0		רם	.ecti	7700				0	#### - 1	Means +	here -	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.50-4.00	U	P 0		E-1	.ect1	ves				U	respons				_	111
				I O		Ω÷	her					2	I CBPOIIB		,c 5191	ıııcaı	10	
		1 0		O.	.11CT					4								

?

0

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ART 624 0101

2

ART & CRIT

JACOB, PREMINDA

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

Fall 2005

Page 154

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

_																		
							Fr	equei	ncie	3		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 yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.44	4.00
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.23	4.23	4.34	4.00
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.34	4.22	4.34	5.00
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	769/1585	4.00	3.79	3.96	4.23	4.00
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	870/1535	4.00	3.68	4.08	4.27	4.00
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1562/1651	3.00	3.83	4.18	4.32	3.00
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.78	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.00	4.07	4.15	5.00
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1300/1586	4.00	4.29	4.43	4.50	4.00
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested :	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.27	4.26	4.33	5.00
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.30	5.00
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	666/1380	4.00	4.34	3.94	3.85	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.17	4.01	4.19	5.00
2. Were a	ill studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	4.52	4.24	4.47	4.00
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	4.53	4.27	4.49	4.00
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	4.04	3.94	4.07	4.00
		Semina	r															
1. Were a	ssigned t	copics relevant	to the	e announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	74/ 103	4.00	4.51	4.41	4.56	4.00
4. Did pr	esentatio	ons contribute	to what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	70/ 99	4.00	4.33	4.39	4.54	4.00
5. Were c	riteria 1	for grading mad	e clear	<u>c</u>	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	50/ 97	4.00	4.27	4.14	4.26	4.00
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 1				ed fo				0	 Graduat		0	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0		ке	quir	ea I	OT M	a JOES	>	U	Graduat	C	U	Ma JC	JΤ	U
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		_						_			_			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0 P 0		El	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### - : respons				_	ih
				I 0		Ot1	her					1	T CBPOHB		c bigi	car		

?

University of Maryland Page 155
Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	ı Quest:	ionnaire
---------	--------	------------	----------	----------

Course-Section: ART 638 0102

1

TEACH PRACTICUM

BRADLEY, STEPHE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

Questions				NR	NA	Fro	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Ran		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		Genera	 1																
1 Did vou	. goin no	Genera w insights,ski	_	thia gourgo	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	1196/1	671	4.50	4.32	4.27	4.44	4.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	0		1146/1		4.50	4.23	4.23	4.34	4.00
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1		5.00	4.34	4.22	4.34	5.00
		was class canc	_	cecea goarb	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1		5.00	4.65	4.69	4.78	5.00
				ing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00			2.17	4.00	4.07		4.00
		Lectur	e																
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lecture	s well p	repared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1300/1	586	4.50	4.29	4.43	4.50	4.00
2. Did the	instruc	tor seem inter	ested in	the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	585	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was led	ture mat	erial presente	d and ex	plained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1504/1	582	4.00	4.27	4.26	4.33	3.00
4. Did the	lecture	es contribute t	o what y	ou learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1487/1	575	4.00	4.23	4.27	4.30	3.00
5. Did aud	liovisual	techniques en	hance yo	ur understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	666/1	380	4.50	4.34	3.94	3.85	4.00
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	520	5.00	4.17	4.01	4.19	5.00
2. Were al	.l studer	nts actively en	couraged	to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	515	5.00	4.52	4.24	4.47	5.00
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair and	open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	511	5.00	4.53	4.27	4.49	5.00
4. Were sp	ecial te	chniques succe	ssful		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	474/	994	4.50	4.04	3.94	4.07	4.00
		Self	Paced																
1. Did sel	f-paced	system contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	61	5.00	5.00	4.09	4.46	5.00
2. Did stu	ıdy quest	cions make clea	r the ex	pected goal	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	29/	52	4.00	4.00	4.26	4.59	4.00
3. Were yo	ur conta	acts with the i	nstructo	r helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	50	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.64	5.00
4. Was the	feedbac	k/tutoring by	proctors	helpful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	23/	35	4.00	4.00	4.36	4.84	4.00
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio:	n										
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Re	asons	3				Тур	oe -			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ijors	5	0	Grad	uate	9	1	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0		~		,				-			,	•			0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	T				1	Unde:	r-gı	rad	0	Non-	major	0
	84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0									0	0.000			1			1-		
Grad.	Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 1 F 0			Εle	ecti	ves				0			Means t			_	n		
	P 0			01						0	resp	onse	es to b	e sign	ıııcan	ıt			
				5 0 T 0		Oti	ner					0							
				r u															

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ART 638 0103

TEACH PRACTICUM

COOK, CATHY

1

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

Page 156 JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

C+1	~	The second second second	0	
Student	course	Evaluation	Ouestionn	aire

					Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	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 vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	4.50	4.32	4.27	4.44	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	4.50	4.23	4.23	4.34	5.00
		uestions reflec		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.27	4.27	4.28	5.00
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.34	4.22	4.34	5.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	3.79	3.96	4.23	5.00
	_	_		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1535	5.00	3.68	4.08	4.27	5.00
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1651		3.83	4.18	4.32	5.00
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.78	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	2.17	4.00	4.07	4.15	5.00
		Lectur	۵															
1 Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	٥	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1586	4.50	4.29	4.43	4.50	5.00
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1585	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.79	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1582	4.00	4.27	4.26	4.33	5.00
		_			0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1575	4.00	4.23	4.27	4.30	5.00
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi				0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1380	4.50	4.34	3.94	3.85	5.00
1 544		Discus			0	0	0	0	^	^	1	F 00	1 /1 500	г оо	4 1 7	4 01	4 10	F 00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.17	4.01	4.19	5.00
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.52	4.24	4.47	5.00
				d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	_		1/1511	5.00	4.53	4.27	4.49	5.00
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssiul		Ü	0	U	U	U	0	1	5.00	1/ 994	4.50	4.04	3.94	4.07	5.00
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1			 mir		or Ma	ior		0	 Graduat		0	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0		1/6/	7 a T T	-u 1	J_ 1'10		_		JIAGAAC	_	0	1.10 ) (		J
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				1	Under-q	rad	1	Non-	major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		001	u.	-				_	3114C1 9		-	1,011		J
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enone	ιh
32 44.	ŭ	3.33 1.00	-	P 0								-	respons				_	,
				I 0		O+1	her					0			3-		-	
				? 0		00.						-						

Course-Section:	ART 638 0123	University of Maryland	Page 157
Title	TEACH PRACTICUM	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:	CAZABON, LYNN (Instr. A)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 1 Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 1651/1656 2.17 4.00 4.07 4.15 1.00

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

Course-Section:	ART 638 0123	University of Maryland	Page 158
Title	TEACH PRACTICUM	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006

Title TEACH PRACTICUM Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: (Instr. B) Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 1

Questionnaires: 1 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 1651/1656 2.17 4.00 4.07 4.15 1.00

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

Course-Section	: ART 638	0123	University o	f Maryland	Page 159	9
Title	TEACH PRAC	CTICUM	Baltimore	County	JAN 21, 2000	б
Instructor:		(Instr. C)	Fall	2005	Job IRBR3029	9

Instructor: (Instr. C) Fall 2005
Enrollment: 1

Ouestionnaires: 1 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General

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

Course-Section	: ART 638 0123	University of Maryland	Page 160
Title	TEACH PRACTICUM	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: (Instr. D) Fall 2005
Enrollment: 1 Ouestionnaires: 1 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General

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

Course-Section: ART 640 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 161

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

1/ 99 5.00 4.33 4.39 4.54 5.00

1/ 97 5.00 4.27 4.14 4.26 5.00

Title IMAGING & DIGITAL STUD

CAZABON, LYNN

4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned

5. Were criteria for grading made clear

Enrollment: 5
Questionnaires: 4

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 1 4.33 854/1674 4.33 4.32 4.27 4.44 4.33 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1674 5.00 4.23 4.23 4.34 5.00 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 2 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 1016/1423 4.00 4.27 4.27 4.28 4.00 0 0 1 3 4.75 222/1609 4.75 4.34 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 326/1585 4.50 3.79 3.96 4.23 4.50 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 00 0 0 4 5.00 1/1535 5.00 3.68 4.08 4.27 5.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 524/1651 4.50 3.83 4.18 4.32 4.50 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1673 5.00 4.65 4.69 4.78 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 615/1656 4.33 4.00 4.07 4.15 4.33 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Ω Ω Ω Ω 0 0 4 5.00 1/1586 5.00 4.29 4.43 4.50 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 917/1585 4.75 4.76 4.69 4.79 4.75 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1582 5.00 4.27 4.26 4.33 5.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1575 5.00 4.23 4.27 4.30 5.00 0 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1380 5.00 4.34 3.94 3.85 5.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1520 5.00 4.17 4.01 4.19 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1515 5.00 4.52 4.24 4.47 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1511 5.00 4.53 4.27 4.49 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 115/ 994 4.75 4.04 3.94 4.07 4.75 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 103 5.00 4.51 4.41 4.56 5.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 101 5.00 4.69 4.48 4.62 5.00 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 2 5.00 0 1/ 95 5.00 4.50 4.31 4.43 5.00

## Frequency Distribution

0 0

2 0

2

0

0

0 0 2 5.00

0 0 0 2 5.00

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2005

Page 162 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	3	Student Cou	urse Ev	valuation	Questionnaire
				_	

Course-Section: ART 720 0101

3

ART HISTORY SEM

SMALLS, JAMES

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Ouestions			Fr 1	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
× « « » » » » » » » » » » » » » » » » »	NR	NA 												
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1449/1674	3.67	4.32	4.27	4.44	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1608/1674	3.00	4.23	4.23	4.34	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1607/1609	2.00	4.34	4.22	4.34	2.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1329/1585	3.33	3.79	3.96	4.23	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	d 0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1355/1535	3.33	3.68	4.08	4.27	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1623/1651	2.33	3.83	4.18	4.32	2.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1361/1673	4.33	4.65	4.69	4.78	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes	s 1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1540/1656	3.00	4.00	4.07	4.15	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1539/1586	3.00	4.29	4.43	4.50	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1406/1582	3.50	4.27	4.26	4.33	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1487/1575	3.00	4.23	4.27	4.30	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	666/1380	4.00	4.34	3.94	3.85	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1353/1520	3.00	4.17	4.01	4.19	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.52	4.24	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	. 0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	507/1511	4.67	4.53	4.27	4.49	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	48/ 103	4.67	4.51	4.41	4.56	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	. 0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	97/ 101	3.33	4.69	4.48	4.62	3.33
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	89/ 95	3.00	4.50	4.31	4.43	3.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	93/ 99	3.00	4.33	4.39	4.54	3.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	73/ 97	3.67	4.27	4.14	4.26	3.67
Fre	quency	y Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	:S			Re	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1		 Re	 quir	ed f	 or M	 ajor	 s	0	Graduat	 e	3	Majo	 r	0

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

Course-Section: ART 740 0101 University of Ma
Title ADV. I&D STUDIO Baltimore Cou
Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN Fall 200

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 5

5

University of Maryland Page 163
Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	eque	ncie	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1674	4.80	4.32	4.27	4.44	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	215/1674	4.80	4.23	4.23	4.34	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	222/1609	4.75	4.34	4.22	4.34	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	557/1585	4.25	3.79	3.96	4.23	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1535	5.00	3.68	4.08	4.27	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	330/1651	4.67	3.83	4.18	4.32	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.78	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.00	4.07	4.15	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	Λ	3	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.29	4.43	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	<i>5</i>	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.29	4.43	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1582		4.70	4.26	4.73	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	495/1575		4.23	4.27	4.30	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	3		143/1380		4.23		3.85	
3. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		U	U	U	U		3	4.75	143/1300	4.75	4.34	3.34	3.03	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.17	4.01	4.19	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.52	4.24	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.53	4.27	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	4.04	3.94	4.07	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	48/ 103	4.67	4 51	4.41	4.56	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	4.69	4.48	4.62	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	38/ 95	4.67	4.50	4.31	4.43	4.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 99	5.00	4.33	4.39	4.54	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	38/ 97	4.50	4.27	4.14	4.26	
_			.,											
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
a 1'.				_					_					

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 164

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ART 790 0125

2

IND. STUDIES

STURGEON, JOHN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

				Frequencies				5	Instructor			Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions					NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course						0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.44	5.00
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1674	5.00	4.23	4.23	4.34	5.00
		uations reflect			1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.34	4.22	4.34	5.00
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to wh	nat you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	3.79	3.96	4.23	5.00
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1535	5.00	3.68	4.08	4.27	5.00
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y explair	ied	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	3.83	4.18	4.32	5.00
8. How mar	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1566/1673	4.00	4.65	4.69	4.78	4.00
9. How wou	uld you	grade the overa	ll teachi	ng effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.00	4.07	4.15	5.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well pr	repared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.29	4.43	4.50	5.00
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1585	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was led	cture mat	terial presente	d and exp	lained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.27	4.26	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.30	5.00
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance you	ır understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.34	3.94	3.85	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned					1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1515/1520	1.00	4.17	4.01	4.19	1.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate					1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.52	4.24	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion				1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1511		4.53	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	4.04	3.94	4.07	5.00
		Semina																
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme				1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 103	5.00		4.41	4.56	5.00	
				ridual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 101	5.00	4.69	4.48	4.62	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned				1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 95	5.00		4.31		5.00	
4. Did pre	esentatio	ons contribute	to what y	ou learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 99	5.00	4.33	4.39	4.54	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	 0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Re	auir	ed f	or Ma	ajors		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0			-1		10	)	-	-	or adda c	-	-		-	•
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge:	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	-major	1
	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			a	_				-	011001 9		_	2.011		-
84-150						r1.	ecti <sup>.</sup>	7700				0	#### - 1	Maana t	hara s	ro not		h
84-150 Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0												TE HOU	. emonc	
		3.50-4.00	1	P 0		15.1		VCB				Ü					_	11
		3.50-4.00	Ţ	- · · ·			her	VCB				1	respons				_	11