

Course-Section: ART 210 0101
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
 Instructor: BRADLEY, STEPHE
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 73
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	7	2	3.64	1459/1674	3.61	4.32	4.27	4.32	3.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	4	5	0	3.00	1608/1674	3.27	4.23	4.23	4.26	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	1313/1609	3.97	4.34	4.22	4.23	3.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	7	3	0	2.93	1585/1651	3.31	3.83	4.18	4.20	2.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1325/1673	4.62	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	2	4	4	0	3.00	1540/1656	3.27	4.00	4.07	4.10	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	9	1	3.79	1406/1586	3.91	4.29	4.43	4.48	3.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	1002/1585	4.54	4.76	4.69	4.76	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	6	4	0	2.86	1536/1582	3.32	4.27	4.26	4.35	2.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	4	5	1	3.07	1477/1575	3.40	4.23	4.27	4.39	3.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	3	7	3	3.86	831/1380	3.83	4.34	3.94	4.03	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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	
2. Were all students actively encouraged 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 instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	2	9	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 994	3.50	4.04	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.34	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 210 0201
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
 Instructor: BRADLEY, STEPHE
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 74
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	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	4.67	483/1515	4.30	4.52	4.24	4.28	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	0	7	4.33	816/1511	4.28	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 994	3.50	4.04	3.94	3.98	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 210 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
 Instructor: CHAN, IRENE
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 75
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	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. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	13	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/1423	****	4.27	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	1440/1585	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	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	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
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 1	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 210 0401
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
 Instructor: SHIFLET, NICOLE
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 76
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	4.08	1458/1585	4.54	4.76	4.69	4.76	4.08	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	1	4	3	2	3.17	1486/1582	3.32	4.27	4.26	4.35	3.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	5	3	2	3.33	1423/1575	3.40	4.23	4.27	4.39	3.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	1	3	3	4	3.67	962/1380	3.83	4.34	3.94	4.03	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	780/1520	3.89	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	4.30	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	4.28	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	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 211 0101
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM
 Instructor: Silberg, Steven
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 77
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	0	1	1	9	4.42	751/1674	4.33	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	721/1674	4.64	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	417/1423	4.71	4.27	4.27	4.36	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	157/1609	4.73	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	3	4	3	1	3.00	1440/1585	3.49	3.79	3.96	3.91	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	3	3	4	0	2.91	1470/1535	3.33	3.68	4.08	4.03	2.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	1044/1651	4.25	3.83	4.18	4.20	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	10	1	4.09	1529/1673	4.63	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.09	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	561/1656	4.30	4.00	4.07	4.10	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	1074/1586	4.42	4.29	4.43	4.48	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	510/1585	4.86	4.76	4.69	4.76	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	935/1582	4.49	4.27	4.26	4.35	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	1107/1575	4.36	4.23	4.27	4.39	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	472/1380	4.48	4.34	3.94	4.03	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to 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 all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	3	9	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 994	3.29	4.04	3.94	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 15 Non-major 7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 9	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 211 0201
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM
 Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 78
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	854/1674	4.33	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	379/1674	4.64	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	376/1423	4.71	4.27	4.27	4.36	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	374/1609	4.73	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	768/1651	4.25	3.83	4.18	4.20	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	887/1673	4.63	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	912/1656	4.30	4.00	4.07	4.10	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	1074/1586	4.42	4.29	4.43	4.48	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	960/1585	4.86	4.76	4.69	4.76	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	777/1582	4.49	4.27	4.26	4.35	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	819/1575	4.36	4.23	4.27	4.39	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	284/1380	4.48	4.34	3.94	4.03	4.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	645/1520	4.32	4.17	4.01	4.03	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	560/1515	4.78	4.52	4.24	4.28	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	2	1	8	4.25	896/1511	4.67	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	1	2	1	0	2	3.00	881/ 994	3.29	4.04	3.94	3.98	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	1	1	0	2	8	4.25	954/1674	4.33	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	191/1674	4.64	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	181/1423	4.71	4.27	4.27	4.36	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	222/1609	4.73	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	6	2	3.75	1049/1585	3.49	3.79	3.96	3.91	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	8	1	3.67	1207/1535	3.33	3.68	4.08	4.03	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	768/1651	4.25	3.83	4.18	4.20	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	4.63	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	451/1656	4.30	4.00	4.07	4.10	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	774/1586	4.42	4.29	4.43	4.48	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	510/1585	4.86	4.76	4.69	4.76	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	217/1582	4.49	4.27	4.26	4.35	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	601/1575	4.36	4.23	4.27	4.39	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	220/1380	4.48	4.34	3.94	4.03	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	454/1520	4.32	4.17	4.01	4.03	4.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage 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	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	3	0	1	3	3.57	708/ 994	3.29	4.04	3.94	3.98	3.57	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	2.75	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.42	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.51	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.69	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.33	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.27	4.14	4.63	****	
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	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.82	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 2	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0		Non-major 5
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	11

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 212 0101
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D
 Instructor: DROGOUL, LAURE
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 80
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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 expected goals	0	0	3	4	4	0	0	2.09	1671/1674	3.30	4.23	4.23	4.26	2.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	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	10	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1585	4.29	3.79	3.96	3.91	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	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	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	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	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 prepared	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 subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	811/1585	4.87	4.76	4.69	4.76	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	4	2	1	2.90	1530/1582	3.75	4.27	4.26	4.35	2.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	5	2	1	3.00	1487/1575	3.67	4.23	4.27	4.39	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	666/1380	4.50	4.34	3.94	4.03	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	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	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 open discussion	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	7	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	474/ 994	4.10	4.04	3.94	3.98	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 5
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 2	Other	6

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 212 0201
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D
 Instructor: NOHE, TIM
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 81
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	719/1674	3.49	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	1	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	4.67	****/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	4.00	****/1535	2.25	3.68	4.08	4.03	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	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	4.19	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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 213 0101
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D
 Instructor: COOK, CATHY
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 82
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	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	3.62	1156/1585	3.28	3.79	3.96	3.91	3.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	11	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1535	2.61	3.68	4.08	4.03	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	1	2	4	4	1	3.17	1544/1651	3.14	3.83	4.18	4.20	3.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1673	4.90	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	507/1656	3.61	4.00	4.07	4.10	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	1211/1586	4.09	4.29	4.43	4.48	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	510/1585	4.70	4.76	4.69	4.76	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	935/1582	3.90	4.27	4.26	4.35	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	601/1575	3.82	4.23	4.27	4.39	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	103/1380	4.26	4.34	3.94	4.03	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	572/1520	4.01	4.17	4.01	4.03	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	629/1515	4.18	4.52	4.24	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	507/1511	4.23	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	3.75	4.04	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	2.75	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.42	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.33	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.27	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	2.75	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	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	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	367/1674	4.23	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	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	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	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	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	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	0	0	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. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	2.75	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	1	0	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	4.00	****/ 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	3.00	****/ 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 213 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D
 Instructor: BRADLEY, STEPHE
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 84
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	1066/1674	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	2	4	5	1	3.23	1579/1674	3.76	4.23	4.23	4.26	3.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	2	4	4	1	3.00	1557/1609	3.83	4.34	4.22	4.23	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	3	3	4	0	2.62	1606/1651	3.14	3.83	4.18	4.20	2.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1673	4.90	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	5	4	0	3.18	1500/1656	3.61	4.00	4.07	4.10	3.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1371/1586	4.09	4.29	4.43	4.48	3.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	567/1585	4.70	4.76	4.69	4.76	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained 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	5	0	0	2	2	5	1	3.50	1367/1575	3.82	4.23	4.27	4.39	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	1	0	3	5	4.00	666/1380	4.26	4.34	3.94	4.03	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	898/1515	4.18	4.52	4.24	4.28	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	7	4	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	881/ 994	3.75	4.04	3.94	3.98	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 2		

Course-Section: ART 213 0401
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D
 Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 85
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	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	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	6	2	3	3.38	1502/1586	4.09	4.29	4.43	4.48	3.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	2	3	6	4.00	1472/1585	4.70	4.76	4.69	4.76	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	5	2	2	3.17	1486/1582	3.90	4.27	4.26	4.35	3.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	3	2	1	2	2.38	1554/1575	3.82	4.23	4.27	4.39	2.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	3	1	7	1	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	3.00	****/ 994	3.75	4.04	3.94	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 214 0101
 Title DRAWING I
 Instructor: GARDNER, SYMMES
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 86
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	342/1674	4.59	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	406/1674	4.50	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	13	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	0	0	5	9	4.64	333/1609	4.63	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	6	4	4	3.86	956/1585	3.86	3.79	3.96	3.91	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1535	****	3.68	4.08	4.03	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	3	0	3	4	2	2	3.27	1520/1651	3.65	3.83	4.18	4.20	3.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1673	4.92	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	257/1656	4.43	4.00	4.07	4.10	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	945/1586	4.64	4.29	4.43	4.48	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	9	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	1	1	7	4.67	438/1582	4.57	4.27	4.26	4.35	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	495/1575	4.70	4.23	4.27	4.39	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	241/1380	4.60	4.34	3.94	4.03	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	6	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	4.04	3.94	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 214 0201
 Title DRAWING I
 Instructor: McConville, Mat
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 87
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	4.50	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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 214 0301
 Title DRAWING I
 Instructor: PENNY, JOHN E
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 88
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	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	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1585	3.86	3.79	3.96	3.91	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	4	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	866/1651	3.65	3.83	4.18	4.20	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	958/1673	4.92	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	615/1656	4.43	4.00	4.07	4.10	4.33	
Lecture															
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	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.48	****	
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	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	4.20	****	
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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	8

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 215 0101
 Title INTRO TO ART & MEDIA
 Instructor: DURANT, MARK
 Enrollment: 113
 Questionnaires: 72

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 89
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	5	4	10	14	33	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	5	5	13	23	20	3.73	1388/1674	3.73	4.23	4.23	4.26	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	54	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	9	1	4	9	19	24	4.07	1048/1609	4.07	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	10	3	0	4	17	30	4.31	502/1585	4.31	3.79	3.96	3.91	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	4	2	4	8	17	31	4.15	787/1535	4.15	3.68	4.08	4.03	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	2	2	3	11	11	36	4.21	924/1651	4.21	3.83	4.18	4.20	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	2	0	0	0	1	62	4.98	142/1673	4.98	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.98	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	2	1	1	8	19	20	4.14	849/1656	4.14	4.00	4.07	4.10	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	1	2	6	56	4.74	517/1586	4.74	4.29	4.43	4.48	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	3	3	60	4.86	664/1585	4.86	4.76	4.69	4.76	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	2	3	11	49	4.59	535/1582	4.59	4.27	4.26	4.35	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	0	8	10	45	4.42	793/1575	4.42	4.23	4.27	4.39	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	1	0	2	6	55	4.78	125/1380	4.78	4.34	3.94	4.03	4.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	5	3	8	15	20	3.82	973/1520	3.82	4.17	4.01	4.03	3.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	2	2	5	11	31	4.31	847/1515	4.31	4.52	4.24	4.28	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	2	0	0	4	44	4.76	402/1511	4.76	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.76	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	41	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	****/ 994	****	4.04	3.94	3.98	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.51	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	71	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.69	4.48	4.45	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	71	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	2.75	3.98	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	71	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	4.23	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	71	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 44	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B 16			
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	5	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 72	Non-major 21
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 60		
				? 1			

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

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	4	A	39	Required for Majors	26	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	34				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 221 0101
 Title ART HISTORY II
 Instructor: OTESEN, BODIL
 Enrollment: 107
 Questionnaires: 100

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 91
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	39	0	1	4	13	24	19	3.92	1309/1674	3.92	4.32	4.27	4.32	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	39	0	3	13	17	20	8	3.28	1572/1674	3.28	4.23	4.23	4.26	3.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	39	0	3	10	13	16	19	3.62	1237/1423	3.62	4.27	4.27	4.36	3.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	39	5	3	9	14	17	13	3.50	1452/1609	3.50	4.34	4.22	4.23	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	39	2	3	4	5	21	26	4.07	728/1585	4.07	3.79	3.96	3.91	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	39	2	5	5	16	21	12	3.51	1295/1535	3.51	3.68	4.08	4.03	3.51	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	39	0	8	8	12	19	14	3.38	1493/1651	3.38	3.83	4.18	4.20	3.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	40	0	0	0	4	27	29	4.42	1300/1673	4.42	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	50	1	3	6	20	19	1	3.18	1500/1656	3.18	4.00	4.07	4.10	3.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	41	0	1	2	8	15	33	4.31	1104/1586	4.31	4.29	4.43	4.48	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	41	0	0	0	0	17	42	4.71	1002/1585	4.71	4.76	4.69	4.76	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	42	0	1	8	13	20	16	3.72	1320/1582	3.72	4.27	4.26	4.35	3.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	42	0	2	4	12	14	26	4.00	1138/1575	4.00	4.23	4.27	4.39	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	41	3	1	5	7	12	31	4.20	540/1380	4.20	4.34	3.94	4.03	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	58	0	20	4	9	4	5	2.29	1493/1520	2.29	4.17	4.01	4.03	2.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	58	0	24	9	4	4	1	1.79	1503/1515	1.79	4.52	4.24	4.28	1.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	60	0	16	4	9	6	5	2.50	1476/1511	2.50	4.53	4.27	4.28	2.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	56	38	1	2	2	1	0	2.50	****/ 994	****	4.04	3.94	3.98	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	99	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.69	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	98	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	99	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	4.33	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	99	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 97	****	4.27	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	99	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	2.75	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	99	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	4.20	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	98	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	98	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	4.23	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	98	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	99	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 3	A 16	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 28		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 3	C 8	General 5	Under-grad 100 Non-major 76
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 12	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 33	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ART 275 0101
 Title INTRO TO PRINTMAKING
 Instructor: JEON, DIANA N
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 92
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	298/1674	4.75	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.75	
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	4.50	
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	4.25	
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	3.13	
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	3.14	
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	4.00	
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	5.00	
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	3.80	

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	4.00	
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	4.83	
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	4.20	
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	4.40	
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	4.00	

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	4.00	
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	4.40	
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	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	751/1674	4.42	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	1026/1674	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/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	5.00	****/1585	****	3.79	3.96	3.95	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1535	****	3.68	4.08	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	3	3	1	4	3.55	1426/1651	3.55	3.83	4.18	4.16	3.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	635/1673	4.92	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	4.57	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	692/1575	4.50	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	489/1380	4.25	4.34	3.94	4.01	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	145/1520	4.89	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	5.00	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	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.33	****	
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	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	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															
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	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	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	5.00	****/ 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	5.00	****/ 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 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	13	Non-major	3
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 315 0101
 Title VIDEO I
 Instructor: GRABILL, VIN
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 94
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1309/1674	3.92	4.32	4.27	4.26	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	1026/1674	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	968/1423	4.08	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	629/1609	4.42	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1228/1651	3.91	3.83	4.18	4.16	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1103/1673	4.64	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	1124/1656	3.91	4.00	4.07	4.07	3.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	1211/1586	4.17	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	1071/1585	4.67	4.76	4.69	4.66	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	1025/1582	4.17	4.27	4.26	4.26	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	1040/1575	4.17	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	103/1380	4.83	4.34	3.94	4.01	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	546/1520	4.36	4.17	4.01	4.09	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	207/1515	4.91	4.52	4.24	4.32	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	0	9	4.55	610/1511	4.55	4.53	4.27	4.34	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	4.04	3.94	3.96	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	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	3.88	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	10	19	4.41	762/1582	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	481/1575	4.74	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	1	3	7	20	4.48	318/1380	4.59	4.34	3.94	4.01	4.48	
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	3.89	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	3.74	1232/1511	4.29	4.53	4.27	4.34	3.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	13	0	3	0	0	2	3.20	****/ 994	3.86	4.04	3.94	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	4.00	****/ 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	2						

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

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	9	0	0	1	2	11	21	4.49	639/1674	4.44	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.49	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	0	1	1	10	23	4.57	495/1674	4.31	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	2	1	6	26	4.60	459/1423	4.29	4.27	4.27	4.27	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	3.44	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	4.90	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	5.00	****/ 278	****	2.75	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	0	0	0	0	0	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	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	42	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 76	****	2.75	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	42	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	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	5.00	****/ 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	44	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 there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	0						

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

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	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	4.11	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	4.00	****/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	4.26	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	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	32	0	4	2	8	10	6	3.40	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	3.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	61	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	61	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 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															
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	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	61	0	0	0	1	0	0	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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected 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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 326 0101
 Title HIST. OF PHOTOGRAPHY I
 Instructor: STEPHANY, JAROM
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 98
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	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	3.82	1175/1515	3.82	4.52	4.24	4.32	3.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	1018/1511	4.10	4.53	4.27	4.34	4.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	26	7	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 994	****	4.04	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 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 responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 9	
			? 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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	243/1674	4.67	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	168/1674	4.76	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.87	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	97/1609	4.75	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1585	4.68	3.79	3.96	3.95	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	197/1651	4.77	3.83	4.18	4.16	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1673	4.87	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	274/1656	4.57	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	301/1586	4.92	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1585	4.85	4.76	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	199/1582	4.74	4.27	4.26	4.26	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	311/1575	4.72	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	567/1380	4.26	4.34	3.94	4.01	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	221/1520	4.73	4.17	4.01	4.09	4.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	165/1515	4.89	4.52	4.24	4.32	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	195/1511	4.60	4.53	4.27	4.34	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	174/ 994	4.53	4.04	3.94	3.96	4.58	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	2.75	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	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	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.33	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.27	4.14	3.48	****	
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	3.20	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	3.82	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 16	Non-major 6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 12		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 331 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I
 Instructor: Kozak, Jennifer
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 100
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1674	4.67	4.32	4.27	4.26	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	124/1674	4.76	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1423	4.75	4.27	4.27	4.27	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	109/1609	4.75	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to 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 written assignments contribute 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 the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	104/1651	4.77	3.83	4.18	4.16	4.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	4.87	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	230/1656	4.57	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1586	4.92	4.29	4.43	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1585	4.85	4.76	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	136/1582	4.74	4.27	4.26	4.26	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	154/1575	4.72	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	227/1380	4.26	4.34	3.94	4.01	4.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	86/ 994	4.53	4.04	3.94	3.96	4.86	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 331 0301
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I
 Instructor: IVY, JEANNE C.
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 101
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	2	1	0	7	4.20	1026/1674	4.67	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	578/1674	4.76	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	6	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	575/1423	4.75	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	645/1609	4.75	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	167/1585	4.68	3.79	3.96	3.95	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	169/1535	4.75	3.68	4.08	4.15	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	393/1651	4.77	3.83	4.18	4.16	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1135/1673	4.87	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	561/1656	4.57	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	249/1586	4.92	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	1183/1585	4.85	4.76	4.69	4.66	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	719/1582	4.74	4.27	4.26	4.26	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	768/1575	4.72	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	666/1380	4.26	4.34	3.94	4.01	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	397/1520	4.73	4.17	4.01	4.09	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	384/1515	4.89	4.52	4.24	4.32	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	3	0	4	3.88	1155/1511	4.60	4.53	4.27	4.34	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	420/ 994	4.53	4.04	3.94	3.96	4.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 332 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II
 Instructor: WITKOWSKI, TRIS
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 102
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	214/1674	4.69	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	446/1674	4.65	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	445/1423	4.54	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	673/1609	4.31	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	0	7	3.92	1201/1651	4.13	3.83	4.18	4.16	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1246/1673	4.31	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	522/1656	4.50	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 the instructor seem interested in 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 lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	850/1582	4.63	4.27	4.26	4.26	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	303/1380	4.40	4.34	3.94	4.01	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 techniques successful	1	6	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	4.04	3.94	3.96	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	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	1	11	4.92	136/1582	4.63	4.27	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	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	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.33	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	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	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	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.29	****	

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 333 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN III
 Instructor: CAMPBELL, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 104
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	176/1674	4.56	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	270/1674	4.50	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1423	4.63	4.27	4.27	4.27	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1609	4.71	4.34	4.22	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	1009/1651	4.15	3.83	4.18	4.16	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1332/1673	4.27	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	794/1656	3.99	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	266/1586	4.69	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1585	4.79	4.76	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and 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	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	958/1575	4.13	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.25	
5. 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	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	489/1520	4.12	4.17	4.01	4.09	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	873/1515	4.32	4.52	4.24	4.32	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	990/1511	4.16	4.53	4.27	4.34	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	591/ 994	3.76	4.04	3.94	3.96	3.86	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 333 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN III
 Instructor: CAMPBELL, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 105
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	954/1674	4.56	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	931/1674	4.50	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	845/1423	4.63	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	629/1609	4.71	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute 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 the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	966/1651	4.15	3.83	4.18	4.16	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	2	4.17	1484/1673	4.27	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	7	0	3.78	1222/1656	3.99	4.00	4.07	4.07	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 the instructor seem interested in 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 lecture material presented 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 the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	1138/1575	4.13	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	3	1	1	0	2.60	1311/1380	3.22	4.34	3.94	4.01	2.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	962/1511	4.16	4.53	4.27	4.34	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	676/ 994	3.76	4.04	3.94	3.96	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	3	1	1	6	3	3.36	1558/1674	3.30	4.32	4.27	4.26	3.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	2	2	6	3	3.57	1465/1674	3.49	4.23	4.23	4.21	3.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	12	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1423	3.50	4.27	4.27	4.27	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	4	1	1	2	5	3.23	1521/1609	3.45	4.34	4.22	4.27	3.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	10	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1585	2.80	3.79	3.96	3.95	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	5	3	0	3	1	1	2.63	1501/1535	2.56	3.68	4.08	4.15	2.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	4	4	0	3	3	2.79	1596/1651	2.60	3.83	4.18	4.16	2.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	915/1673	4.78	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	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	1472/1585	3.95	4.76	4.69	4.66	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	3	2	3	4	3.29	1467/1582	3.37	4.27	4.26	4.26	3.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	2	3	2	3	3.00	1487/1575	3.17	4.23	4.27	4.25	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	1298/1380	2.52	4.34	3.94	4.01	2.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	3	1	6	3.50	1169/1520	3.25	4.17	4.01	4.09	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	2	2	2	7	3.86	1158/1515	3.93	4.52	4.24	4.32	3.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	3	1	3	7	4.00	1050/1511	3.60	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	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	2.75	2.75	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.33	****	
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	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
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	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	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	3						

Course-Section: ART 334 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN IV
 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

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	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	4.23	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	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	1	0	4	3	2	2	1	2.42	1619/1651	2.60	3.83	4.18	4.16	2.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	929/1673	4.78	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	3	5	0	3.33	1444/1656	3.07	4.00	4.07	4.07	3.33	
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	1	1	6	1	1	3.00	1353/1520	3.25	4.17	4.01	4.09	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1024/1515	3.93	4.52	4.24	4.32	4.00	
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															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
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	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 103	****	4.51	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.69	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	93/ 99	3.00	4.33	4.39	4.29	3.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	2	0	0	2	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	10	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	1	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	0	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
 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 335 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN V
 Instructor: KIRSTEL, HARVEY
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 108
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	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	3.36	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	3.77	1210/1511	3.77	4.53	4.27	4.34	3.77	
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	3.50	****/ 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
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 108
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	27	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	3	8	4.58	509/1674	4.58	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	4.50	****/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	8	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1535	****	3.68	4.08	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	843/1651	4.09	3.83	4.18	4.16	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	706/1673	4.66	4.65	4.69	4.68	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	4.07	4.07	4.50	
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	4.34	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	1	0	0	1	3	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	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	5.00	****/ 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	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	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															
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	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	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	5.00	****/ 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	5.00	****/ 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 341 0201
 Title INTRO TO ANIMATION
 Instructor: Delaney, Rick
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 110
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	509/1674	4.58	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected 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 evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	743/1609	4.58	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	10	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1535	****	3.68	4.08	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	1	2	1	6	3.91	1228/1651	4.09	3.83	4.18	4.16	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1300/1673	4.66	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1146/1656	4.19	4.00	4.07	4.07	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 instructor seem interested in 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 material presented and explained 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 lectures contribute to what 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	0	0	10	4.64	220/1380	4.59	4.34	3.94	4.01	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	5	0	5	4.00	1024/1515	4.41	4.52	4.24	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and 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 techniques successful	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 contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	3.20	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 342 0101
 Title FILM/VIDEO THEORY & CR
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 111
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	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	0	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	2.00	****/ 994	****	4.04	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 345 0101
 Title FILM II:SOUND & IMAGE
 Instructor: COOK, CATHY
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 112
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	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	3	3	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.27	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	312/1609	4.67	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	1562/1651	3.00	3.83	4.18	4.16	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	887/1673	4.80	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1211/1586	4.17	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	737/1585	4.83	4.76	4.69	4.66	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1348/1582	3.67	4.27	4.26	4.26	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	886/1575	4.33	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	200/1380	4.67	4.34	3.94	4.01	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	572/1520	4.33	4.17	4.01	4.09	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	483/1515	4.67	4.52	4.24	4.32	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	507/1511	4.67	4.53	4.27	4.34	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	964/ 994	2.50	4.04	3.94	3.96	2.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 346 0101
 Title VIDEO II
 Instructor: GRABILL, VIN
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 113
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	248/1674	4.78	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the 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 evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	202/1609	4.78	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 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	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	118/1656	4.88	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.88	
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	4.42	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	567/1585	4.90	4.76	4.69	4.66	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	246/1582	4.80	4.27	4.26	4.26	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	327/1575	4.78	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	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	0	1	7	4.88	151/1520	4.88	4.17	4.01	4.09	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	360/1515	4.78	4.52	4.24	4.32	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	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	1	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	148/ 994	4.67	4.04	3.94	3.96	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

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

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	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	3.87	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	4	4.29	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	2	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	4.00	****/ 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	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.69	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 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	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.75	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 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	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 356 0101
 Title ALTERNATIVE PROCESSES
 Instructor: PEREGOY, CHRIST
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 115
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	3.93	1356/1586	3.93	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															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	4	7	3	3.80	986/1520	3.80	4.17	4.01	4.09	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	1	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	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	5	Under-grad	17	Non-major	1
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	9				
			? 0						

Course-Section: ART 359 0101
 Title TOPICS IN PHOTOGRAPHY
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 116
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	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	4.86	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	4.69	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	4.64	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	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 360 0101
 Title MIXED MEDIA BOOK ARTS
 Instructor: CHAN, IRENE
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 117
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	298/1674	4.75	4.32	4.27	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	2.75	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	2.63	1501/1535	2.63	3.68	4.08	4.15	2.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	5	2	3.58	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	6	4.55	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	11	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	4.34	3.94	4.01	4.00	
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	3.00	****/ 76	****	2.75	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 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	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	****	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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 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	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	5	
?	0			

Course-Section: ART 382 0101
 Title INTERACTIVITY
 Instructor: THWING, JENNIE
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 118
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1559/1674	3.33	4.23	4.23	4.21	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.27	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1609	****	4.34	4.22	4.27	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	3	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1557/1585	2.33	3.79	3.96	3.95	2.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	1	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1289/1651	3.80	3.83	4.18	4.16	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	4	0	0	2.80	1592/1656	2.80	4.00	4.07	4.07	2.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1391/1586	3.83	4.29	4.43	4.42	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1354/1585	4.33	4.76	4.69	4.66	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1348/1582	3.67	4.27	4.26	4.26	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1402/1575	3.40	4.23	4.27	4.25	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	962/1380	3.67	4.34	3.94	4.01	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1092/1520	3.67	4.17	4.01	4.09	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	827/1515	4.33	4.52	4.24	4.32	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1511	****	4.53	4.27	4.34	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	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	1	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	12	Non-major	8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

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

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	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	4.67	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															
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	5.00	****/ 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	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.18	****	
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	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.33	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	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	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	5.00	****/ 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	5.00	****/ 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ART 385 0101
 Title DIGITAL MONTAGE
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 120
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	0	11	4.57	521/1674	4.57	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	406/1674	4.64	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	575/1423	4.50	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	192/1609	4.79	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	912/1651	4.21	3.83	4.18	4.16	4.21	
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	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	185/1656	4.75	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 the instructor seem interested in 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 lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	217/1582	4.83	4.27	4.26	4.26	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	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	2	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	397/1520	4.50	4.17	4.01	4.09	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	2	8	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	732/ 994	3.50	4.04	3.94	3.96	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 388 0101
 Title ART ON THE INTERNET
 Instructor: REINSEL, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 121
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1603/1674	3.17	4.32	4.27	4.26	3.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	2	0	2.83	1639/1674	2.83	4.23	4.23	4.21	2.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.27	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1452/1609	3.50	4.34	4.22	4.27	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1385/1585	3.20	3.79	3.96	3.95	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1535	****	3.68	4.08	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	1	2	0	0	2.00	1636/1651	2.00	3.83	4.18	4.16	2.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1361/1673	4.33	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1610/1656	2.67	4.00	4.07	4.07	2.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	3.00	1539/1586	3.00	4.29	4.43	4.42	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1354/1585	4.33	4.76	4.69	4.66	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	1	2	0	2.67	1557/1582	2.67	4.27	4.26	4.26	2.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	1524/1575	2.83	4.23	4.27	4.25	2.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	866/1380	3.80	4.34	3.94	4.01	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	3.17	1315/1520	3.17	4.17	4.01	4.09	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1167/1515	3.83	4.52	4.24	4.32	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	4.53	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	732/ 994	3.50	4.04	3.94	3.96	3.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	2.75	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 389B 0101
 Title LANDSCRAPE CUBED
 Instructor: BAILEY, DAN
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 122
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	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	4.40	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	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	3.67	1207/1535	3.67	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	4.80	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	4.78	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.78	
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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 392 0101
 Title TOPICS IN ART OR MEDIA
 Instructor: IVY, JEANNE C.
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 123
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.26	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected 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 questions reflect the expected goals	4	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.27	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected 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 readings contribute 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 assignments contribute 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 system clearly explained	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 cancelled	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 overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1656	4.92	4.00	4.07	4.07	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	336/1586	4.85	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	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	6	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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1380	4.93	4.34	3.94	4.01	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	810/1520	4.36	4.17	4.01	4.09	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	483/1515	4.83	4.52	4.24	4.32	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	507/1511	4.83	4.53	4.27	4.34	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 392 0201
 Title TOPICS IN ART OR MEDIA
 Instructor: IVY, JEANNE C.
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 124
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	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	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 392C 0101
 Title DESIGN AND MARKETING
 Instructor: YAGER, DAVID
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 125
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	671/1674	4.46	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	721/1674	4.42	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	10	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.27	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	629/1609	4.42	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	1	8	0	3.33	1329/1585	3.33	3.79	3.96	3.95	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	1	4	6	0	3.25	1386/1535	3.25	3.68	4.08	4.15	3.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	2	0	2	3	6	0	3.36	1496/1651	3.36	3.83	4.18	4.16	3.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	2	11	0	3.85	1630/1673	3.85	4.65	4.69	4.68	3.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	106/1656	4.90	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	618/1586	4.69	4.29	4.43	4.42	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	713/1585	4.85	4.76	4.69	4.66	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	798/1582	4.38	4.27	4.26	4.26	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	838/1575	4.38	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	489/1380	4.25	4.34	3.94	4.01	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to 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 all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	657/ 994	3.71	4.04	3.94	3.96	3.71	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 392D 0101
 Title CONCEPTUAL DESIGN
 Instructor: YAGER, DAVID
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 126
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1385/1674	3.80	4.32	4.27	4.26	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	2	2	3	3.30	1568/1674	3.30	4.23	4.23	4.21	3.30	
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	4.27	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	1320/1609	3.75	4.34	4.22	4.27	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	3	2	2	0	2.63	1537/1585	2.63	3.79	3.96	3.95	2.63	
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	
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	
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	
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	
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	3.60	
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	4.30	
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	3.50	
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	3.80	
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															
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	4.30	
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	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	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. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
Self Paced															
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

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

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

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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	14	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	258/1585	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	454/1535	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	4.56	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	4.76	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	
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	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	2.75	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. 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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 425 0101
 Title WRIT BY & ABOUT ARTIST
 Instructor: SPITZ, ELLEN
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 128
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	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	2	0	3.33	1559/1674	3.33	4.23	4.23	4.31	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1016/1423	4.00	4.27	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	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	3	4.17	642/1585	4.17	3.79	3.96	4.01	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	1	0	3.00	1435/1535	3.00	3.68	4.08	4.18	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1324/1651	3.75	3.83	4.18	4.23	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1361/1673	4.33	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	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	4.20	4.27	4.26	4.31	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1402/1575	3.40	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	4.00	4.34	3.94	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	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	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		7
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	5

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 429A 0101
 Title ISSUES BLACK,QUEER & F
 Instructor: SMALLS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 129
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	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	3.50	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	4.57	3.68	4.08	4.18	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	3.83	4.18	4.23	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	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	4.67	1071/1585	4.67	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	632/1582	4.50	4.27	4.26	4.31	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	886/1575	4.33	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	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	4.50	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	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	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	4.67	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	167/1609	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	238/1535	4.67	3.68	4.08	4.18	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	5	2	4	3.75	1324/1651	3.75	3.83	4.18	4.23	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	1072/1673	4.67	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	149/1656	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	4.78	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	4.70	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1380	****	4.34	3.94	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	373/1520	4.55	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	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	244/1511	4.91	4.53	4.27	4.45	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	0	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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 431 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN VII
 Instructor: STANLEY, RICHA
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 131
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	928/1674	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.42	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	657/1674	4.34	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	1268/1423	3.50	4.27	4.27	4.34	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	0	3	5	4.10	1029/1609	4.32	4.34	4.22	4.30	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	3	1	0	2	3.17	1400/1585	3.40	3.79	3.96	4.01	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to 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 explained	1	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	934/1651	3.60	3.83	4.18	4.23	4.20	
8. How many times was 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 grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	849/1656	4.24	4.00	4.07	4.19	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	858/1586	4.40	4.29	4.43	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	1142/1585	4.80	4.76	4.69	4.76	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	777/1582	4.30	4.27	4.26	4.31	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	1100/1575	4.20	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	612/1380	3.87	4.34	3.94	4.04	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions 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 students actively encouraged 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 instructor encourage fair and 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 techniques successful	2	3	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	600/ 994	4.00	4.04	3.94	4.19	3.83	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 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 responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 0		

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	891/1674	4.29	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	5.00	****/1423	3.50	4.27	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	443/1609	4.32	4.34	4.22	4.30	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	0	3	0	2	3	3.63	1149/1585	3.40	3.79	3.96	4.01	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	737/1535	4.03	3.68	4.08	4.18	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	4	3	0	2	2	2	3.00	1562/1651	3.60	3.83	4.18	4.23	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	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	4.33	615/1656	4.24	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	4.34	3.94	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	4.00	4.04	3.94	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	5.00	****/ 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	5.00	****/ 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	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 435A 0101
 Title REPRESENTATION
 Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 133
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	3	7	0	3.70	1429/1674	3.70	4.32	4.27	4.42	3.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	6	2	2	3.60	1451/1674	3.60	4.23	4.23	4.31	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	743/1609	4.33	4.34	4.22	4.30	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to 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 written assignments contribute 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	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	2	2	3	2	3.56	1422/1651	3.56	3.83	4.18	4.23	3.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1203/1673	4.50	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1162/1656	3.86	4.00	4.07	4.19	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	663/1586	4.67	4.29	4.43	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	438/1582	4.67	4.27	4.26	4.31	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	768/1575	4.44	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	86/1380	4.89	4.34	3.94	4.04	4.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	673/1520	4.22	4.17	4.01	4.18	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	384/1515	4.75	4.52	4.24	4.40	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	602/1511	4.56	4.53	4.27	4.45	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 994	****	4.04	3.94	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 447 0101
 Title 2D ANIMATION/COMPOSITI
 Instructor: DYER, ERIK G
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 134
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	1056/1674	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.42	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	1	4	3.75	1370/1674	4.03	4.23	4.23	4.31	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the 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 other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	1094/1609	4.14	4.34	4.22	4.30	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1535	****	3.68	4.08	4.18	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	2	2	2	2	2.67	1604/1651	3.22	3.83	4.18	4.23	2.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	635/1673	4.96	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1222/1656	3.56	4.00	4.07	4.19	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 the instructor seem interested in 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 lecture material presented and 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 the lectures contribute to 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	626/1380	4.33	4.34	3.94	4.04	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	638/ 994	3.75	4.04	3.94	4.19	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	891/1674	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.42	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	870/1674	4.03	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	4.67	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	3.50	1223/1585	3.70	3.79	3.96	4.01	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/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	3.43	1495/1586	3.55	4.29	4.43	4.46	3.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1292/1585	4.30	4.76	4.69	4.76	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	5	0	3.71	1326/1582	3.72	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	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1520	4.00	4.17	4.01	4.18	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1515	4.71	4.52	4.24	4.40	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1511	4.57	4.53	4.27	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	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	4.38	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	4.25	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	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	191/1520	4.80	4.17	4.01	4.18	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.52	4.24	4.40	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	244/1511	4.90	4.53	4.27	4.45	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	9	1	0	0	0	0	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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected 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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 480 0101
 Title HIST/THEORY IMAGING
 Instructor: MAHONEY, JAMES
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 137
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	687/1674	4.28	4.32	4.27	4.42	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	1009/1674	3.94	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1423	****	4.27	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	202/1609	4.39	4.34	4.22	4.30	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	136/1585	4.60	3.79	3.96	4.01	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	215/1535	4.30	3.68	4.08	4.18	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	613/1651	3.92	3.83	4.18	4.23	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	706/1673	4.65	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	149/1656	4.53	4.00	4.07	4.19	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	214/1586	4.64	4.29	4.43	4.46	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	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	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	170/1582	4.57	4.27	4.26	4.31	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	279/1575	4.59	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	303/1380	4.31	4.34	3.94	4.04	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.17	4.01	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.52	4.24	4.40	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.53	4.27	4.45	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	1	0	0	5	4.00	474/ 994	4.38	4.04	3.94	4.19	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.51	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.69	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.33	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.27	4.14	4.46	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 480 0201
 Title HIST/THEORY IMAGING
 Instructor: MAHONEY, JAMES
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 138
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	1115/1674	4.28	4.32	4.27	4.42	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	1401/1674	3.94	4.23	4.23	4.31	3.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1094/1609	4.39	4.34	4.22	4.30	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	413/1585	4.60	3.79	3.96	4.01	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to 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 clearly explained	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 cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1311/1673	4.65	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	719/1656	4.53	4.00	4.07	4.19	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1034/1586	4.64	4.29	4.43	4.46	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	935/1582	4.57	4.27	4.26	4.31	4.25	
4. Did 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	603/1380	4.31	4.34	3.94	4.04	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.52	4.24	4.40	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.53	4.27	4.45	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	115/ 994	4.38	4.04	3.94	4.19	4.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.51	4.41	4.42	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.33	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	4.27	4.14	4.46	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	5
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	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	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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 goals	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 goals	1	4	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1155/1423	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.34	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	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 learned	0	8	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1585	****	3.79	3.96	4.01	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	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 effectiveness	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 subject	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	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 understanding	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 learned	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 participate	6	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	4.52	4.24	4.40	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	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 information	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	2.75	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.31	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.51	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.69	4.48	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	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 learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 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	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 486 0101
 Title ADVANCED INTERACTIVITY
 Instructor: REINSEL, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 140
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	3.00	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	3.80	1180/1515	3.80	4.52	4.24	4.40	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	4.53	4.27	4.45	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	881/ 994	3.00	4.04	3.94	4.19	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	8
			P 0		Non-major
			I 0		3
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 487 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL INTERFACE
 Instructor: REINSEL, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 141
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	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	2.75	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	4.00	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	4.67	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	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	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	B 1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 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 responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	3				
				? 0						

Course-Section: ART 491 0110
 Title SPECIAL STUDIES
 Instructor: O'DELL, KATHY (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 142
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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

Frequency Distribution

Credits 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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 491 0110
 Title SPECIAL STUDIES
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 143
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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

Frequency Distribution

Credits 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	B 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
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 491 0110
 Title SPECIAL STUDIES
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 144
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	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

Frequency Distribution

Credits 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	B 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 responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 491 0110
 Title SPECIAL STUDIES
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 145
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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

Frequency Distribution

Credits 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	B 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
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 494 0115
 Title INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: RE, PEGGY
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 146
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	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	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	4.50	4.00	4.07	4.19	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 494 0120
 Title INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: CHAN, IRENE
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 147
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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	0	1	0	4.00	955/1656	4.50	4.00	4.07	4.19	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 494 0130
 Title INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 148
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected 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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 495 0103
 Title INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH
 Instructor: STAFF
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 149
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected 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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 495 0129
 Title INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH
 Instructor: CHAN, IRENE
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 150
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected 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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 495 0146
 Title INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 151
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	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

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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	4.00	4.07	4.15	4.50	
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	4.34	3.94	3.85	5.00	
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	
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
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 152
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 620 0101
 Title HIST I&D ARTS
 Instructor: MAHONEY, JAMES
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 153
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	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	3	0	0	0	0	1	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	4	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	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	3.79	3.96	4.23	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute 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 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	1	3	4.75	958/1673	4.75	4.65	4.69	4.78	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	257/1656	4.67	4.00	4.07	4.15	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 instructor seem interested 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 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	0	4	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	1	3	4.75	143/1380	4.75	4.34	3.94	3.85	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 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	1	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	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	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	2	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	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.27	4.14	4.26	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 624 0101
 Title ART & CRIT
 Instructor: JACOB, PREMINDA
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 154
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.44	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	4.34	4.00	
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	4.34	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute 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 the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1562/1651	3.00	3.83	4.18	4.32	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	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.00	4.07	4.15	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 the instructor seem interested 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 lecture material presented 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 the lectures contribute to 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	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	0	0	0	1	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	1	0	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	4.52	4.24	4.47	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	4.04	3.94	4.07	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the 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 presentations 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 criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	50/ 97	4.00	4.27	4.14	4.26	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 638 0102
 Title TEACH PRACTICUM
 Instructor: BRADLEY, STEPHE
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 155
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1196/1674	4.50	4.32	4.27	4.44	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1146/1674	4.50	4.23	4.23	4.34	4.00
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	4.34	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	4.78	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	955/1656	2.17	4.00	4.07	4.15	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1300/1586	4.50	4.29	4.43	4.50	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested 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 lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1504/1582	4.00	4.27	4.26	4.33	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1487/1575	4.00	4.23	4.27	4.30	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	666/1380	4.50	4.34	3.94	3.85	4.00
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	4.19	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	4.47	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	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	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 self-paced system contribute to what 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 study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	29/ 52	4.00	4.00	4.26	4.59	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor 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 feedback/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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 638 0103
 Title TEACH PRACTICUM
 Instructor: COOK, CATHY
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 156
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	4.50	4.32	4.27	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	4.50	4.23	4.23	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	1	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	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	3.79	3.96	4.23	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	4.27	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	4.32	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	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	2.17	4.00	4.07	4.15	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1586	4.50	4.29	4.43	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested 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 lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1582	4.00	4.27	4.26	4.33	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1575	4.00	4.23	4.27	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	4.50	4.34	3.94	3.85	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	4.19	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	4.47	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	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 994	4.50	4.04	3.94	4.07	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 638 0123
 Title TEACH PRACTICUM
 Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 157
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected 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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 638 0123
 Title TEACH PRACTICUM
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 158
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected 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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 638 0123
 Title TEACH PRACTICUM
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 159
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected 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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 638 0123
 Title TEACH PRACTICUM
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 160
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected 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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 640 0101
 Title IMAGING & DIGITAL STUD
 Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 161
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	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	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	0	1	0	1	4.00	1016/1423	4.00	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	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	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	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	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	0	0	0	0	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	0	4	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	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	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	2	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	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.27	4.14	4.26	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 720 0101
 Title ART HISTORY SEM
 Instructor: SMALLS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 162
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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	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 effectiveness	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	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 3	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 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 responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 3		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ART 740 0101
 Title ADV. I&D STUDIO
 Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 163
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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	0	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	5	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.27	4.26	4.33	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	495/1575	4.67	4.23	4.27	4.30	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1380	4.75	4.34	3.94	3.85	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	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 4	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 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 responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 4		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 790 0125
 Title IND. STUDIES
 Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 164
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.23	4.23	4.34	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.34	4.22	4.34	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what 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 written assignments contribute 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 grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	3.83	4.18	4.32	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1566/1673	4.00	4.65	4.69	4.78	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.00	4.07	4.15	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.29	4.43	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.34	3.94	3.85	5.00	
Discussion															
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	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.53	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	4.04	3.94	4.07	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 103	5.00	4.51	4.41	4.56	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	5.00	1/ 95	5.00	4.50	4.31	4.43	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 99	5.00	4.33	4.39	4.54	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						