University of Maryland Page 66 Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

C+1	a	The second second second	0
Student	course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

		Ou a stá ass	_		NTD	27.7		_	ncies		_		ructor	_		e Dept		Level	Sect
		Questions 	5 		NR 	NA	1	2 	3 	4	5 	Mean	Rar	1K.	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	l																
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,skil	lls from	this course	2	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	1077/1	1669	4.07	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.13
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	ected goals	2	0	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	1094/1	1666	3.74	4.18	4.19	4.29	4.00
3. Did th	ie exam qu	estions reflect	the ex	pected goals	2	13	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/]	1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.35	****
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	2	0	0	3	1	4	8	4.06	993/1	1617	3.95	4.30	4.15	4.24	4.06
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	ate to w	hat you learned	2	13	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/]	1555	2.80	3.73	4.00	3.96	***
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contri	ibute to	what you learned	2	3	5	3	3	1	1	2.23	1531/1	1543	2.36	3.85	4.06	4.10	2.23
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly	y explai:	ned	2	1	0	3	3	5	4	3.67	1321/1	1647	3.42	3.97	4.12	4.19	3.67
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		3	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1	1668	4.71	4.62	4.67	4.59	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overal	ll teach	ing effectiveness	7	1	2	0	0	6	2	3.60	1312/1	1605	3.47	4.13	4.07	4.15	3.60
		Lecture	2																
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectures	s well p	repared	4	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	1255/1	1514	3.61	4.26	4.39	4.39	3.93
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor seem intere	ested in	the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	788/1	1551	4.78	4.74	4.66	4.72	4.80
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presented	d and ex	plained clearly	3	0	0	2	3	7	3	3.73	1245/1	1503	3.40	4.22	4.24	4.29	3.73
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to	what y	ou learned	3	0	2	0	2	7	4	3.73	1250/1	1506	3.43	4.20	4.26	4.33	3.73
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques enh	nance yo	ur understanding	3	1	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	470/1	1311	4.15	4.26	3.85	3.96	4.21
		Discuss	sion																
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contribu	ate to w	hat you learned	4	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	535/1	1490	4.01	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.43
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively end	couraged	to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	504/1	1502	4.56	4.37	4.26	4.31	4.64
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage i	fair and	open discussion	4	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	986/1	1489	4.27	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.14
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	ssful		4	9	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	810/1	1006	3.26	4.06	4.00	3.99	3.40
		Laborat	cory																
2. Were y	ou provid	ded with adequat	te backg	round information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
		Field W	Work																
1. Did fi	eld exper	rience contribut	te to wh	at you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	58	****	2.50	4.22	4.20	***
2. Did yo	u clearly	y understand you	ır evalu	ation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	52	****	1.67	4.06	5.00	***
3. Was th	e instruc	ctor available i	for cons	ultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	39	****	****	4.39	5.00	***
4. To wha	t degree	could you discu	ıss your	evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	40	****	****	3.97	5.00	***
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carry	y out fi	eld activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****
		Self I	Paced																
1. Did se	lf-paced	system contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	55	****	5.00	4.34	4.67	****
2. Did st	udy quest	cions make clear	r the ex	pected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	42	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	***
3. Were y	our conta	acts with the in	nstructo	r helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	46	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****
4. Was th	e feedbac	ck/tutoring by p	proctors	helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	33	****	5.00	4.25	5.00	****
5. Were t	here enou	agh proctors for	r all th	e students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	29	****	5.00	4.34	5.00	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons					Тур	pe			Majors	;
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0																7
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3					кес	quir	ea r	or Ma	Jor	b	0	Grac	duate	=	0	Majo	JΙ	/	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 3	General							0	Unde	er-gi	rad :	18	Non-	-major	11
84-150 Grad.	2 0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	2 0	D 0 F 0		E]	ecti [.]	ves				0	###±	± - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	rh
orua.	Ŭ	3.33 1.00	ŭ	P 0			_001					-				oe sigr			,
				I 0		Otl	her				1	3				. 5-			

1

Course Section: ART 210 0101 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS

BRADLEY, STEPHE Instructor:

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

Enrollment:

17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 67

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Ouestic	nnaires:	17	Student.	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
QUEDETE	minatics.	1 /	beadene	COULDC	DValuation	Queberonnarie

								_	ncies	;	_		ructor		_		Level	
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	2	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	988/1669	4.07	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.20
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	2	0	2	0	4	5	4	3.60	1432/1666	3.74	4.18	4.19	4.29	3.60
3. Did th	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	2	13	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.35	****
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	2	1	0	2	3	5	4	3.79	1235/1617	3.95	4.30	4.15	4.24	3.79
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	13	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1555	2.80	3.73	4.00	3.96	****
				o what you learned	4	3	3	3	3	0	1	2.30	1527/1543	2.36	3.85	4.06	4.10	2.30
		g system clearl		ined	3	1	3	3	2	4	1		1559/1647	3.42	3.97	4.12	4.19	2.77
		was class canc			2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668		4.62	4.67	4.59	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	7	0	1	2	3	4	0	3.00	1501/1605	3.47	4.13	4.07	4.15	3.00
_		Lectur									_							
		uctor's lecture			11	0	1	3	0	0	2		1477/1514			4.39	4.39	2.83
		ctor seem inter			10	0	0	0	0	1	6		650/1551		4.74	4.66	4.72	4.86
				xplained clearly	10	0	2	0	3	1			1442/1503		4.22	4.24	4.29	2.86
		es contribute t			10	0	2	2	1	1			1450/1506		4.20	4.26	4.33	2.57
5. Did au	diovisua.	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	11	2	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	****/1311	4.15	4.26	3.85	3.96	****
		Discus																
				what you learned	8	0	0	1	3	2	3		1022/1490		4.17	4.05	4.11	3.78
				d to participate	8	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	486/1502		4.37	4.26	4.31	4.67
				d open discussion	8	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	936/1489	4.27	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.22
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		8	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1006	3.26	4.06	4.00	3.99	****
		Self																
				what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.67	****
		tions make clea			16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42		5.00	4.31	5.00	****
		acts with the i			16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****
4. Was th	e feedba	ck/tutoring by	proctor	s helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.25	5.00	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	crib	ıtioı	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			ТУ	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	 0	A 3		Rec		ed fo	or Ma	ior	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 8								-		-	-) (5
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	7	Non-	-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									J				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - 1					ιh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
				I 0		Oth	ner				1	.1						

Course Section: ART 210 0301

Title VISUAL CONCEPTS

Instructor: CHAN, IRENE

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 68 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	4	6	5	3.88	1307/1669	4.07	4.26	4.23	4.34	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	6	3	3.63	1417/1666	3.74	4.18	4.19	4.29	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	6	5	4.00	1029/1617	3.95	4.30	4.15	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	1	7	4	0	2.80	1482/1555	2.80	3.73	4.00	3.96	2.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	4	3	2	3	1	2.54	1511/1543	2.36	3.85	4.06	4.10	2.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	4	5	5		1241/1647	3.42	3.97	4.12	4.19	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	2		1464/1668	4.71	4.62	4.67	4.59	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	7	1	3.82	1164/1605	3.47	4.13	4.07	4.15	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	8	4	4.07	1182/1514	3.61	4.26	4.39	4.39	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	1000/1551	4.78	4.74	4.66	4.72	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	4	4	4		1301/1503		4.22	4.24	4.29	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	5	5	4.00	1069/1506	3.43	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	5	1	6	4.08	547/1311	4.15	4.26	3.85	3.96	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	6	5	3.81	998/1490	4.01	4.17	4.05	4.11	3.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	781/1502	4.56	4.37	4.26	4.31	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	765/1489	4.27	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	3	3	2	1	3.11	917/1006	3.26	4.06	4.00	3.99	3.11
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.63	4.38	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.36	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.75	4.20	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	2.50	4.22	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	1.67	4.06	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	***	****	4.33	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.25	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	5.00	***

Course Section: ART 210 0301
Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
Instructor: CHAN, IRENE

18

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 68 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	8
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	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						jor 8

Course Section: ART 211 0101

Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM

Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 69 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

				eque:			_		ructor	Course	_		Level	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	734/1669	4.51	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	605/1666		4.18	4.19	4.29	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	3	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	939/1421	4.15	4.47	4.24	4.35	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	242/1617	4.61	4.30	4.15	4.24	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	7	2	5	3.73	1079/1555	3.80	3.73	4.00	3.96	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	l 3	14	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1543	3.78	3.85	4.06	4.10	***
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	1	3	2	8	4.21	907/1647	4.35	3.97	4.12	4.19	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	13	1	4.00	1530/1668	4.33	4.62	4.67	4.59	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	373/1605	4.43	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	799/1514	4.53	4.26	4.39	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	954/1551	4.69	4.74	4.66	4.72	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	686/1503	4.51	4.22	4.24	4.29	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	744/1506	4.41	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	163/1311	4.40	4.26	3.85	3.96	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	622/1490	4.37	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	306/1502		4.37	4.26	4.31	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	532/1489	4.64	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	235/1006	3.96	4.06	4.00	3.99	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.63	4.38	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.36	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.50	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.75	4.20	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.25	5.00	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	5.00	****
Fred	quency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	:			Re	ason	g			Ty	ne			Majors	

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

Course Section: ART 211 0201

VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM

Title Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 20 Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 70 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Questions				Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 6. Reflect the expected goals 7. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 8. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall prepared 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special teachingues successful 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were goal provided with destranding of the material 5. Were requirements for lab reported early specified 6. Did visually specified 7. Did the lab increase uncourage fair and open discussion 8. Were necessary material available for a bandwrite and the forward of the material available for a bandwrite fair for year of the material available for a bandwrite fair for year of the water of the water of the provided assistance 9. Were prev	Questions	NR	NA		_			5		_		_			
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 6. Reflect the expected goals 7. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 8. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall prepared 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special teachingues successful 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were goal provided with destranding of the material 5. Were requirements for lab reported early specified 6. Did visually specified 7. Did the lab increase uncourage fair and open discussion 8. Were necessary material available for a bandwrite and the forward of the material available for a bandwrite fair for year of the material available for a bandwrite fair for year of the water of the water of the provided assistance 9. Were prev															
2. Did the Instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 15 4.70 31/1666 4.66 4.18 4.19 4.29 4.70 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 1 0 1 5 12 4.42 6.15 4.71 4.24 4.35 3.78 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 1 0 1 5 12 4.42 6.12 1.5 4.74 4.24 4.35 3.78 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 2 0 4 8 5 3.74 1079/1555 3.80 3.73 4.00 3.96 4.03 4.42 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 7 1 1 2 4 4 3.75 1138/143 3.78 3.65 4.06 4.10 3.75 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 1 6 12 4.58 401/1647 4.55 3.77 4.12 4.19 4.55 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 2 5 8 4.40 499/1605 4.43 4.37 4.12 4.19 4.55 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 2 5 8 4.40 499/1605 4.31 4.62 4.67 4.59 4.05 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 2 5 8 4.40 499/1605 4.43 4.37 4.17 4.05 4.40 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 1 2 0 16 4.63 1009/151 4.69 4.74 4.66 4.72 4.63 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 1 2 0 16 4.63 1009/151 4.69 4.74 4.66 4.72 4.63 1. Did the lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 2 3 14 4.63 431/1510 4.51 4.09 4.24 4.29 4.63 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 5 1 12 4.26 901/1506 4.41 4.00 4.26 4.33 4.26 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 5 8 4.13 786/1490 4.37 4.17 4.05 4.11 4.13 1. Were easily attached the subject 3 0 0 0 1 1 4 11 4.63 52/1502 4.72 4.73 4.26 4.31 4.63 1. Did the instructor subject 5 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 1 1 4.63 52/1502 4.72 4.73 4.26 4.31 4.63 1. Did the instructor subject 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		0	^	_	1	0	4	1.0	4 45	676 (1660	4 51	4 06	4 00	1 21	4 45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. As the grading system clearly explained 7. As the grading system clearly explained 7. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. As the grading system clearly explained 7. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8. How many times was clear assignment to be supported by the world you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8. How many times was clear assignment to be supported by the world you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8. How many times was clear assignment to be supported by the world you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8. How many times was clear assignment to be supported by the world you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 9. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Were special techniques successful 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified			-												
4. bid other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. Do 0 0 1 6 12 8 4 8 3.75 1138/1543 3.78 3.85 4.06 4.10 3.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 1 2 3 13 4.42 923/1514 4.53 4.26 4.39 4.39 4.42 4.50 4.26 4.30 4.42 4.50 4.26 4.30 4.42 4.50 4.26 4.30 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.5							_								
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. O 2 0 4 8 5 3.74 1079/1555 3.80 3.73 4.00 3.96 3.74 7.75 138/1543 3.78 3.85 4.06 4.10 3.75 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 0 1 6 12 4.58 401/1647 4.35 3.97 4.12 4.19 4.58 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 2 15 8 4.40 499/1605 4.43 4.13 4.07 4.15 4.40 9.05 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 2 5 8 4.40 499/1605 4.43 4.13 4.07 4.15 4.40 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00	-														
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 0 0 0 0 1 6 1 25 3 4.05 1803/1668 4.33 4.62 4.67 4.59 4.05 8. How mould you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5. 0 0 0 0 2 15 3 4.05 1803/1668 4.33 4.62 4.67 4.59 4.05 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. 0 0 1 0 1 2 0 18 4.42 923/1514 4.53 4.26 4.39 4.39 4.42 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. 0 0 1 2 0 1 8 4.63 1069/1551 4.69 4.74 4.66 4.72 4.63 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lactures contribute to what you learned 1. 0 0 1 0 1 5 1 12 4.69 901/1506 4.41 4.0 4.26 3.85 3.96 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were special techniques enhance your understanding 3. Were all students actively succuraged to participate 4 0 0 0 1 4 11 4.63 527/1502 4.72 4.72 4.29 4.33 4.63 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4 0 0 0 0 1 4 11 4.63 527/1502 4.72 4.72 4.29 4.31 4.63 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4 0 0 0 0 1 4 11 4.63 527/1502 4.72 4.72 4.64 4.93 4.93 4.84 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5. O 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 1.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	• •														
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 0 0 0 1 1 6 12 4.58 401/1647 4.35 3.97 4.12 4.19 4.58 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 0 0 0 2 15 8 4.00 499/1605 4.43 4.13 4.07 4.15 4.40 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. 0 0 1 0 2 3 13 4.42 923/1514 4.53 4.26 4.39 4.39 4.42 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. 0 0 1 2 0 16 4.63 1069/1551 4.69 4.74 4.66 4.72 4.63 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4. 0 0 0 1 4 11 4.63 522/1502 4.72 4.37 4.05 4.31 4.33 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques enderseful and open discussion 4. Were special techniques sunderstanding of the material 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab increase with the design sensing for learned 4. Did the lab increase of the material 4. Did the lab increase of the material for lab activities 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6. Did the lab increase of the material 6. Did the lab increase of the material for lab activities 7. Were special techniques explained assistance 8. Each and 1. Did the lab increase of the material for lab activities 8. Each and 1. Did the lab increase of the material for lab activities 8. Each and 1. Did the lab increase of the material for lab activities 8. Each and 1. Did the lab increase of the material for lab activities 8. Each and 1. Did the lab increase of the material for lab activities 8. Each and 1. Did the lab increase of the material for lab activities 8. Each and 1. Did the lab increase of the material for lab activities 8. Each and 1. Did the lab increase of the material for lab activities for lab activities 8. Each and 1. Did the lab increase of the material for lab activities 9. Each and 1. Did the lab increase of the material f	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		-				-	_							
8. How many times was class cancelled															
New would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 2 5 8 4.40 499/1605 4.43 4.13 4.07 4.15 4.40			-												
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. On 1	-	-	-	-	-	_		-							
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 1 0 2 3 1 3 4.42 923/1514 4.53 4.26 4.39 4.39 4.42	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	U	U	U	2	5	8	4.40	499/1605	4.43	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 2 0 16 4.63 1069/1551 4.69 4.74 4.66 4.72 4.63 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 2 1 2 12 4.26 901/1506 4.51 4.20 4.26 4.33 4.26 5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 1 5 1 12 4.26 901/1506 4.41 4.20 4.26 4.33 4.26 5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 1 5 8 1 12 4.26 901/1506 4.41 4.20 4.26 3.85 3.96 4.42 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 2 0 0 0 5 8 8 4.13 786/1490 4.37 4.17 4.05 4.11 4.13 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 1 4 11 4.63 521/1502 4.72 4.37 4.26 4.31 4.63 4. Were special techniques successful 4 8 2 0 2 1 3 3.38 823/1006 3.96 4.06 4.00 3.99 3.38 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 16 2 0 0 0 1 1 4 15 4.50 ****/ 226 ***** 4.20 4.42 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 1 0 1 3 3.00 ****/ 225 ***** 4.19 4.36 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 1 0 1 1 0 1 3 3.00 ****/ 223 **** 4.15 4.59 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.88 4.36 4.60 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 3 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.88 4.36 4.60 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 2 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.88 4.36 4.60 **** 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16 2 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.88 4.36 4.60 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 16 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 98 **** 4.00 3.95 4.20 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 1 1 0 2 3.75 ***/ 98 **** 4.00 3.95 4.20 **** 5. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16 0 0 1 1 0 2 3.75 ***/ 52 *** 1.67 4.06 5.00 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 2 1 1.35 ***/ 55 *** 5.00 4.34 4.67 **** 5. Did study questions	Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 2 0 16 4.63 1069/1551 4.69 4.74 4.66 4.72 4.63 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 2 1 2 12 4.26 901/1506 4.51 4.20 4.26 4.33 4.26 5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 1 5 1 12 4.26 901/1506 4.41 4.20 4.26 4.33 4.26 5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 1 5 8 1 12 4.26 901/1506 4.41 4.20 4.26 3.85 3.96 4.42 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 2 0 0 0 5 8 8 4.13 786/1490 4.37 4.17 4.05 4.11 4.13 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 1 4 11 4.63 521/1502 4.72 4.37 4.26 4.31 4.63 4. Were special techniques successful 4 8 2 0 2 1 3 3.38 823/1006 3.96 4.06 4.00 3.99 3.38 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 16 2 0 0 0 1 1 4 15 4.50 ****/ 226 ***** 4.20 4.42 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 1 0 1 3 3.00 ****/ 225 ***** 4.19 4.36 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 1 0 1 1 0 1 3 3.00 ****/ 223 **** 4.15 4.59 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.88 4.36 4.60 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 3 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.88 4.36 4.60 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 2 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.88 4.36 4.60 **** 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16 2 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.88 4.36 4.60 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 16 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 98 **** 4.00 3.95 4.20 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 1 1 0 2 3.75 ***/ 98 **** 4.00 3.95 4.20 **** 5. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16 0 0 1 1 0 2 3.75 ***/ 52 *** 1.67 4.06 5.00 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 2 1 1.35 ***/ 55 *** 5.00 4.34 4.67 **** 5. Did study questions	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	3	13	4.42	923/1514	4.53	4.26	4.39	4.39	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 1 3 2 13 4.42 319/1311 4.40 4.26 4.38 3.96 4.42 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 2 0 0 5 8 4.13 786/1490 4.37 4.17 4.05 4.11 4.13 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 1 4 11 4.63 52/1502 4.27 4.37 4.26 4.31 4.63 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 1 4 11 4.63 52/1502 4.24 4.37 4.26 4.31 4.63 4.63 4. Were special techniques successful 4 8 2 0 2 1 3 3.38 823/1006 3.96 4.06 4.00 3.99 3.38 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 16 2 0 0 1 1 4 15 4.50 ****/ 226 ***** 4.20 4.42 ****/ 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 1 0 1 0 1 3.00 ****/ 233 ***** 4.19 4.36 ****/ 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 1 0 1 1 0 1 3.30 ****/ 225 ***** 4.50 4.74 ****/ 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 1 0 1 1 0 1 3.00 ****/ 233 ***** 4.63 4.71 ****/ 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 2 0 0 0 0 2 3 5.00 ****/ 223 ***** 4.53 4.71 ****// 5. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16 3 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****// 226 ***** 4.63 4.38 4.59 ****// 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 16 3 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****// 92 **** 4.63 4.38 4.59 ****// 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 16 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 2 3.75 ****// 92 **** 4.00 4.95 4.50 ****// 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 16 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 2 2 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 0		1	0	0	1	2	0	16	4.63	1069/1551	4.69	4.74	4.66	4.72	4.63
Discussion Discus	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	425/1503	4.51	4.22	4.24	4.29	4.63
Discussion Discus	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	1	12	4.26	901/1506	4.41	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.26
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2		1	0	0	1	3	2	13	4.42	319/1311	4.40	4.26	3.85	3.96	4.42
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2															
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 1 1 4 11 4.63 522/1502 4.72 4.37 4.26 4.31 4.63 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 1 1 4 11 4.63 574/1489 4.64 4.49 4.29 4.36 4.63 4.80 Were special techniques successful 4 8 2 0 2 1 3 3.38 823/1006 3.96 4.06 4.00 3.99 3.38 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 16 2 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 223 **** **** 4.20 4.42 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 1 0 1 0 1 3.00 ****/ 233 **** **** 4.19 4.36 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 1 0 1 1 0 1 3.30 ****/ 233 **** **** 4.19 4.36 **** 4. Did the lab intructor provide assistance 16 1 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 3.33 ****/ 225 **** **** 4.50 4.74 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 2 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 206 **** 4.15 4.59 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 97 *** 4.88 4.36 4.60 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 16 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.00 ****/ 97 *** 4.88 4.36 4.60 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 16 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.00 ****/ 98 **** 4.00 3.95 4.20 **** 5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 1 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 98 **** 4.00 3.95 4.20 **** 5. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16 0 0 1 1 0 2 3.75 ****/ 52 *** 1.67 4.06 5.00 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16 0 0 1 0 0 0 2 1 3.50 ****/ 33 **** 4.39 5.00 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 *** 5.00 4.24 4.20 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 16 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 *** 5.00 4.31 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 16 1 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 45 *** 5.00 4.45 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback tutoring by proctors helpful 16 1 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 45 *** 5															
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 1 1 4 11 4.63 574/1489 4.64 4.49 4.29 4.36 4.63 4. Were special techniques successful 4 8 2 0 2 1 3 3.38 823/1006 3.96 4.06 4.00 3.99 3.38 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 16 2 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 226 **** **** 4.20 4.42 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 1 0 1 0 1 3.00 ****/ 233 **** **** 4.19 4.36 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 1 0 1 1 0 1 3.00 ****/ 233 **** **** 4.19 4.36 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 2 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 206 **** **** 4.15 4.59 **** 8. Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16 3 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 206 **** 4.88 4.36 4.60 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.88 4.36 4.60 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 2 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 98 **** 4.00 3.95 4.20 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 98 **** 4.00 3.95 4.20 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 1 0 1 2 4.00 ****/ 58 **** 2.50 4.22 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16 0 0 1 1 0 2 3.75 ****/ 58 **** 2.50 4.22 4.20 **** 2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 40 **** 3.97 5.00 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 1 0 0 2 1 3.50 ****/ 40 **** 3.97 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 16 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 5.00 4.31 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 16 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 5.00 4.35 5.00 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 16 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 5.00 4.35 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 16 1 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 5.00 4.35 5.00 **** 3. Was the instructor provide assistance 16 0 0 1 0 0 0 1															
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. B 2 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.50 ****/ 226 **** **** 4.20 4.42 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6. 1 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 223 **** **** 4.50 4.71 **** 2. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 7. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 8. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 9. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 16. 2 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.88 4.36 4.60 **** 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16. 2 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 98 **** 4.00 3.95 4.20 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16. 0 0 1 0 1 0 2 3.75 ****/ 98 **** 4.00 3.95 4.20 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16. 0 0 1 0 1 0 2 3.75 ****/ 58 **** 2.50 4.22 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 16. 0 0 0 0 0 1 3.50 ****/ 58 **** 2.50 4.22 4.20 **** 2. Did such experience contribute to what you learned 16. 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 2 3.75 ****/ 58 **** 2.50 4.22 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16. 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 2 3.75 ****/ 58 **** 2.50 4.22 4.20 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 16. 0 0 0 0 0 1 3.50 ****/ 58 **** 2.50 4.24 4.00 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 16. 2 0 0 0 0 2 1 3.50 ****/ 58 **** 2.50 4.24 4.00 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16. 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0															
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 6. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 9. Was the instructor available for individual attention 9. Did presearch projects contribute to what you learned 16. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 16. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 18. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19. Did selection available for consultation 19. Did selection	-						_								
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 16 2 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 **** 226 **** **** 4.20 4.42 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 1 0 1 0 1 3.00 **** 233 **** **** 4.19 4.36 **** 4.19 4.20 4.42 **** 4.19 4.20 4.42 **** 4.20 4.20 **** 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20	4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	823/1006	3.96	4.06	4.00	3.99	3.38
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 16 2 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 **** 226 **** **** 4.20 4.42 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 1 0 1 0 1 3.00 **** 233 **** **** 4.19 4.36 **** 4.19 4.20 4.42 **** 4.19 4.20 4.42 **** 4.20 4.20 **** 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20	Tabanatan.														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 1 0 1 0 1 3.00 **** / 233 **** **** 4.19 4.36 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 1 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 **** / 225 **** **** 4.50 4.74 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 1 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 **** / 223 **** **** 4.55 4.71 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 2 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 **** / 206 **** **** 4.15 4.59 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** / 112 **** 4.63 4.38 4.59 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** / 97 **** 4.88 4.36 4.60 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 16 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** / 92 **** 5.00 4.22 4.50 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 16 2 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 **** / 98 **** 4.00 3.95 4.20 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 16 1 0 0 0 1 0 1 2 4.00 **** / 98 **** 4.00 3.95 4.20 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 1 0 1 2 4.00 **** / 58 **** 2.50 4.22 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16 0 0 1 1 0 2 3.75 **** / 52 **** 1.67 4.06 5.00 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 16 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 **** / 39 **** **** 4.39 5.00 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 16 2 0 0 0 1 2 5.00 **** / 30 **** **** 4.39 5.00 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16 2 0 0 0 1 0 3.50 **** / 30 **** **** 4.33 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** / 42 **** 5.00 4.34 4.67 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** / 42 **** 5.00 4.45 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 16 1 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 **** / 42 **** 5.00 4.45 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 16 1 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** / 33 **** 5.00 4.25 5.00 ****	•	1.0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4 50	++++/ 226	++++	++++	4 20	4 40	++++
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 1 0 1 1 0 0 1 3.33 ****/ 225 **** **** 4.50 4.74 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 1 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 223 **** **** 4.35 4.71 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 2 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 206 **** **** 4.15 4.59 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 112 **** 4.63 4.38 4.59 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.88 4.36 4.60 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 2 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** 5.00 4.22 4.50 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 16 1 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 98 **** 4.00 3.95 4.20 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 1 0 1 2 4.00 ****/ 98 **** 4.00 3.95 4.20 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 16 0 0 1 1 0 2 3.75 ****/ 52 **** 1.67 4.06 5.00 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 16 2 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 40 **** 4.33 5.00 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 2 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 40 **** 4.33 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 16 3 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 5.00 4.34 4.67 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 16 3 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 5.00 4.35 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 16 3 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 5.00 4.35 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 16 3 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 5.00 4.25 5.00 ****						-									
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6. 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 **** / 223 **** **** 4.35 4.71 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 4. Did greece could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 5. Did conferences belpful 6. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribu							-								
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16. 0 0 1 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.63 4.38 4.59 **** 18. Were criteria for grading made clear 19. Were criteria for grading made clear 10. Were criteria for grading made clear the expected goal 10. Were criteria for grading made clear the expected goal 10. Were criteria for grading made clear the expected goal 10. Were criteria for grading made clear the expected goal 10. Were criteria for grading made clear the expected goal 10. Were criteria for grading made clear the expected goal 10. Were criteria for grading made clear the expected goal 10. Were criteria for grading made clear the expected goal 10. Were criteria for grading made clear the expected goal 10. Were criteria for grading made clear the expected goal 10. Were criteria for grading made clear the expected goal 10. Were criteria for grading made clear for grading made cl							-	_							
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme								-							
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5. Were requirements for tab reports clearly specified	Τ0	2	U	U	U	2	U	4.00	***/ 206			4.15	4.59	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.88 4.36 4.60 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 5.00 4.22 4.50 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 16 2 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 105 **** 4.75 4.20 4.63 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 16 1 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 98 **** 4.00 3.95 4.20 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 1 0 1 2 4.00 ****/ 58 **** 2.50 4.22 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16 0 0 1 1 0 2 3.75 ****/ 52 **** 1.67 4.06 5.00 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 16 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.75 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 5.00 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 16 2 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.39 5.00 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16 2 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.33 5.00 **** 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0 1 0 0 2 1 3.50 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.33 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 5.00 4.34 4.67 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 16 1 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.45 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 43 **** 5.00 4.25 5.00 ****	Seminar														
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 6. 16. 2. 0. 0. 0. 2. 0. 4.00 ****/ 105 **** 4.75 4.20 4.63 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 6. 0. 0. 1. 0. 1. 2. 4.00 ****/ 58 **** 2.50 4.22 4.20 **** Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 7. 16. 0. 0. 1. 1. 0. 2. 3.75 ****/ 52 **** 1.67 4.06 5.00 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 7. 16. 0. 0. 0. 0. 1. 3. 4.75 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 5.00 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 7. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 7. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 7. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 7. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 7. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 7. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7. Did self-pa	1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.63	4.38	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 16 2 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 **** 105 **** 4.75 4.20 4.63 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 16 1 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 **** 98 **** 4.00 3.95 4.20 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 1 0 1 2 4.00 **** 58 **** 2.50 4.22 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16 0 0 1 1 0 2 3.75 **** 52 **** 1.67 4.06 5.00 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 16 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 **** 39 **** **** 4.39 5.00 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 16 2 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 4.33 5.00 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16 2 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 **** 4.33 5.00 **** 4.33 5.00 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0 1 0 0 2 1 3.50 **** 5.00 4.34 4.67 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 42 **** 5.00 4.31 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 16 1 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 **** 46 **** 5.00 4.25 5.00 ****	2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.36	4.60	****
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 1 0 1 2 4.00 ****/ 58 **** 4.00 3.95 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16 0 0 1 1 0 2 3.75 ****/ 52 **** 1.67 4.06 5.00 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 16 0 0 0 1 1 0 2 3.75 ****/ 52 **** 4.39 5.00 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 16 2 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 5.00 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16 2 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.33 5.00 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0 1 0 0 2 1 3.50 ***/ 30 **** *** 4.33 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 16 3 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 5.00 4.31 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 16 1 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.45 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 33 **** 5.00 4.25 5.00 ****	3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.50	***
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 1 0 1 2 4.00 ****/ 58 **** 2.50 4.22 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16 0 0 1 1 0 2 3.75 ****/ 52 **** 1.67 4.06 5.00 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 16 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 5.00 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 16 2 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 3.97 5.00 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16 2 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.33 5.00 **** 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0 1 0 0 2 1 3.50 ****/ 55 **** 5.00 4.34 4.67 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 5.00 4.31 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 16 1 0 0 1 1 4.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.45 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 33 **** 5.00 4.25 5.00 ****	4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.75	4.20	4.63	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 1 0 1 2 4.00 **** 58 **** 2.50 4.22 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16 0 0 1 1 0 2 3.75 **** 52 **** 1.67 4.06 5.00 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 16 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 **** 39 **** **** 4.39 5.00 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 16 2 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 40 **** **** 3.97 5.00 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16 2 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 **** 30 **** **** 4.33 5.00 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0 1 0 0 2 1 3.50 **** 55 **** 5.00 4.34 4.67 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 42 **** 5.00 4.31 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 16 1 0 0 1 1 4.00 **** 46 *** 5.00 4.45 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 33 *** 5.00 4.25 5.00 ****	5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 1 0 1 2 4.00 **** 58 **** 2.50 4.22 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16 0 0 1 1 0 2 3.75 **** 52 **** 1.67 4.06 5.00 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 16 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 **** 39 **** **** 4.39 5.00 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 16 2 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 40 **** **** 3.97 5.00 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16 2 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 **** 30 **** **** 4.33 5.00 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0 1 0 0 2 1 3.50 **** 55 **** 5.00 4.34 4.67 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 42 **** 5.00 4.31 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 16 1 0 0 1 1 4.00 **** 46 *** 5.00 4.45 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 33 *** 5.00 4.25 5.00 ****															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16 0 0 1 1 0 2 3.75 **** 52 **** 1.67 4.06 5.00 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 16 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 **** 39 **** **** 4.39 5.00 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 16 2 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 40 **** **** 3.97 5.00 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16 2 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 **** 7 30 **** **** 4.33 5.00 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0 1 0 0 2 1 3.50 **** 5 5 *** 5.00 4.34 4.67 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 42 *** 5.00 4.31 5.00 *** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 16 1 0 0 1 1 4.00 **** 46 *** 5.00 4.45 5.00 *** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 7 33 *** 5.00 4.25 5.00 ****							_	_							
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 16 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 5.00 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 16 2 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 3.97 5.00 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16 2 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.33 5.00 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0 1 0 0 2 1 3.50 ****/ 55 **** 5.00 4.34 4.67 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 5.00 4.31 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 16 1 0 0 1 1 4.00 ****/ 46 *** 5.00 4.45 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 33 **** 5.00 4.25 5.00 ****										,					
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 16 2 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 40 *** **** 3.97 5.00 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16 2 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 **** 30 *** **** 4.33 5.00 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0 1 0 0 2 1 3.50 **** 5.00 4.34 4.67 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 42 **** 5.00 4.31 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 16 1 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 **** 46 *** 5.00 4.45 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 33 *** 5.00 4.25 5.00 ****								_		, -					
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0 1 0 0 2 1 3.50 ****/ 30 **** 5.00 4.34 4.67 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 5.00 4.31 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 16 1 0 0 1 1 4.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.45 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 33 **** 5.00 4.25 5.00 ****								_		,					
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0 1 0 0 2 1 3.50 ****/ 55 **** 5.00 4.34 4.67 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 5.00 4.31 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 16 1 0 0 1 1 4.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.45 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 33 **** 5.00 4.25 5.00 ****										,	****				
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0 1 0 0 2 1 3.50 **** 55 *** 5.00 4.34 4.67 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 42 *** 5.00 4.31 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 16 1 0 0 1 1 4.00 **** 46 *** 5.00 4.45 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 33 *** 5.00 4.25 5.00 ****	5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0 1 0 0 2 1 3.50 **** 55 *** 5.00 4.34 4.67 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 42 *** 5.00 4.31 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 16 1 0 0 1 1 4.00 **** 46 *** 5.00 4.45 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 33 *** 5.00 4.25 5.00 ****	Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 5.00 4.31 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 16 1 0 0 1 1 4.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.45 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 33 **** 5.00 4.25 5.00 ****	1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 16 1 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 **** 46 **** 5.00 4.45 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 33 **** 5.00 4.25 5.00 ****		16	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 16 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 33 **** 5.00 4.25 5.00 ****				0	0	1	1	1	4.00		****				****
						0	1	0	4.00		****				****
	5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	5.00	****

Course Section: ART 211 0201

Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM

Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA Enrollment:

20 Questionnaires: 20 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 70 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course Section: ART 211 0301 University of Maryland Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: SILBERG, STEVEN

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 71

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

				Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	5	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Genera	 1														
l. Did you gain new insights,ski	lls from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	389/1669	4.51	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.6
2. Did the instructor make clear	the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	181/1666	4.66	4.18	4.19	4.29	4.8
3. Did the exam questions reflect	t the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	242/1421	4.15	4.47	4.24	4.35	4.7
4. Did other evaluations reflect	the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	323/1617	4.61	4.30	4.15	4.24	4.6
5. Did assigned readings contrib	ute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	6	5	3.93	889/1555	3.80	3.73	4.00	3.96	3.9
5. Did written assignments contri	ibute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	8	3	3.80	1101/1543	3.78	3.85	4.06	4.10	3.8
7. Was the grading system clearly	y explained	0	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	851/1647	4.35	3.97	4.12	4.19	4.2
3. How many times was class cance	elled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	499/1668	4.33	4.62	4.67	4.59	4.9
9. How would you grade the overa	ll teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	499/1605	4.43	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.4
Lecture	e														
l. Were the instructor's lecture	s well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	584/1514	4.53	4.26	4.39	4.39	4.6
2. Did the instructor seem intere	ested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	917/1551	4.69	4.74	4.66	4.72	4.7
3. Was lecture material presented	d and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	621/1503	4.51	4.22	4.24	4.29	4.4
4. Did the lectures contribute to	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	613/1506	4.41	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.5
5. Did audiovisual techniques enl	nance your understanding	0	1	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	552/1311	4.40	4.26	3.85	3.96	4.0
Discus	sion														
l. Did class discussions contrib	ute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	356/1490	4.37	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.6
2. Were all students actively end	couraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	438/1502	4.72	4.37	4.26	4.31	4.7
3. Did the instructor encourage	fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	553/1489	4.64	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.6
4. Were special techniques succes	ssful	1	6	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	479/1006	3.96	4.06	4.00	3.99	4.0
	Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA				Rea	asons	5			Тут	pe			Majors	3	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_			
				2	Ο						

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

VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D Baltimore County DROGOUL, LAURE Fall 2006

Instructor: DROGOUL, LAURE

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 72 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

					Fre	eque	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new i		rom this course	5	0	1	2	3	2	1	3.00	1596/1669	3.56	4.26	4.23	4.34	3.00
2. Did the instructor			5	0	1	1	4	3	0	3.00	1578/1666	3.45	4.18	4.19	4.29	3.00
3. Did the exam quest			5	7	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1421	3.75	4.47	4.24	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluati	ons reflect the e	expected goals	5	2	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	1579/1617	3.63	4.30	4.15	4.24	2.71
5. Did assigned readi	ngs contribute to	what you learned	5	5	2	2	0	0	0	1.50	1553/1555	3.11	3.73	4.00	3.96	1.50
6. Did written assign	ments contribute	to what you learned	5	2	5	2	0	0	0	1.29	1542/1543	2.36	3.85	4.06	4.10	1.29
7. Was the grading sy	stem clearly expl	lained	5	1	1	3	2	1	1	2.75	1560/1647	3.03	3.97	4.12	4.19	2.75
8. How many times was	class cancelled		5	0	0	0	2	7	0	3.78	1611/1668	4.27	4.62	4.67	4.59	3.78
9. How would you grad	le the overall tea	aching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1428/1605	3.50	4.13	4.07	4.15	3.33
	T a = +															
1. Were the instructo	Lecture	l propared	7	0	2	2	2	Λ	1	2 /2	1490/1514	3.60	4.26	4.39	4.39	2.43
2. Did the instructor			7	0	1	1	0	1	4		1452/1551	4.46	4.74	4.66	4.72	3.86
3. Was lecture materi		_	7	0	2	1	2	2			1466/1503		4.22	4.24	4.29	2.57
4. Did the lectures of	_		7	0	1	2	4	0			1467/1506		4.20	4.26	4.33	2.43
5. Did audiovisual te		-	7	0	0	4	2	0	1		1203/1311		4.26	3.85	3.96	
		7														
	Discussion															
 Did class discussi 		_	6	0	2	2	0	4	0		1404/1490			4.05	4.11	2.75
2. Were all students			6	0	1	1	1	1	4		1208/1502		4.37	4.26	4.31	3.75
3. Did the instructor	-	and open discussion	6	0	0	3	2	0			1328/1489		4.49	4.29	4.36	3.38
4. Were special techn	iques successful		6	1	3	2	2	0	0	1.86	1002/1006	3.11	4.06	4.00	3.99	1.86
	Field Work															
1. Did field experien		what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	2.50	4.22	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly un		_	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52		1.67	4.06	5.00	****
4. To what degree cou	-		13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****
5. Did conferences he	elp you carry out	field activities	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	***	****	4.33	5.00	***
		Frequ	iencv	Dist	rib	utio	n									
	rieg															
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту:	pe 			Majors	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9	_			
				?	0						

Course Section: ART 212 0201

VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D

Title DROGOUL, LAURE Instructor:

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 15

28-55

56-83

Grad.

84-150

4

0

2

0

1.00-1.99

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

0

5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

0

0

Under-grad 15

- Means there are not enough

Non-major

Page 73

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fr 1	eque: 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	S M
G														
General Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	2	4	5	1	2 02	1610/1669	3.56	4.26	4.23	1 21	2
Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	5	3	0		1634/1666		4.28	4.23	4.34	2
Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	1	0		****/1421		4.10	4.19	4.29	-
Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	2	6	2	1		1516/1617			4.15	4.24	
Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	1	1	0		****/1555			4.15	3.96	
Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	4	2	1	1			1537/1543			4.06		
Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	5	3	4	0			1616/1647	2.36		4.12	4.10 4.19	
	0	0	0	0	3	8						4.12	4.19	
How many times was class cancelled	1	1	3	2	3 4	4			1498/1668			4.67	4.15	
How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	Т	Τ	3	۷	4	4	U	2.09	1546/1605	3.50	4.13	4.07	4.15	
Lecture														
Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	4	0	5	5	0		1479/1514		4.26	4.39	4.39	
Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	8		1193/1551		4.74	4.66	4.72	
Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	2	2	5			1418/1503		4.22	4.24	4.29	
Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	1	3	5			1450/1506		4.20	4.26	4.33	
Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	4	4	4	3.64	861/1311	3.91	4.26	3.85	3.96	
Discussion														
Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	3	4	4	3.62	1112/1490	3.74	4.17	4.05	4.11	
Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	944/1502	4.16	4.37	4.26	4.31	
Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	818/1489	4.22	4.49	4.29	4.36	
Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	738/1006	3.11	4.06	4.00	3.99	:
Laboratory														
Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	
Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	
Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	
Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	
Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	
Seminar														
Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.63	4.38	4.59	
Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.36	4.60	
Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.75	4.20	4.63	
Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	
Field Work														
Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	2.50	4.22	4.20	
Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 52	****	1.67	4.06	5.00	
To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	***	****	3.97	5.00	
Self Paced														
Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.67	
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	_				asons				ጥናን	ne			Majore	c c
cuits marined Cuiii. GPA Expected Grades				ĸe	asums	•			Ту	ρe			Majors	>

General

Electives

6

0

0

С

D

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 14 0

Course Section: ART 212 0301 University of Maryland Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: SHEFFIELD, SAM

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 74

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	500/1669	3.56	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	676/1666	3.45	4.18	4.19	4.29	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	3.75	4.47	4.24	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	11	4.75	219/1617	3.63	4.30	4.15	4.24	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	541/1555	3.11	3.73	4.00	3.96	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1543	2.36	3.85	4.06	4.10	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	1	6	3.83	1223/1647	3.03	3.97	4.12	4.19	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	641/1668	4.27	4.62	4.67	4.59	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	666/1605	3.50	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1514	3.60	4.26	4.39	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1551	4.46	4.74	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	277/1503	3.60	4.22	4.24	4.29	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	147/1506	3.45	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1311	3.91	4.26	3.85	3.96	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	400/1490	3.74	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	306/1502	4.16	4.37	4.26	4.31	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	252/1489	4.22	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	479/1006	3.11	4.06	4.00	3.99	4.00
-														

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

Course Section: ART 212 0401

Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D

Instructor: OLDENBURG, AARO

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 75 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions					Fre	eanei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 6. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 7. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 8. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 8. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 9. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 9. Did variety of the grading system clearly explained 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you lear		Questions	NR	NA		_			5				_			Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 4. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 5. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 6. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 7. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 7. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 8. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 8. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 8. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 8. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Was the grading system clearly explained 9. The would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes 9. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. O 0 1 0 6 6 4.31 1353/1668 4.27 4.62 4.67 4.59 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. O 0 0 0 3 2 5 5 4.20 1118/1514 3.60 4.26 4.79 4.39 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful 5. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7. Were you provided with adequate background information 8. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8. Were you provided with adequate		1														
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 10 0 0 1 0 0 5 2 1 1 3.75 1135/1421 3.75 4.47 4.24 4.35 4. Did coher evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 10 0 0 0 1 3 4 6 4.07 987/1617 3.63 4.30 4.15 4.24 6.35 4. Did coher evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 3 4 6 4.07 987/1617 3.63 4.30 4.15 4.24 6.35 4. Did coher evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 3 4 6 4.07 987/1617 3.63 4.30 4.15 4.24 6.35 4. Did coher evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 3 4 6 4.07 987/1617 3.63 4.30 4.15 4.24 4.35 4. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 1 1 0 0 2 4 4 3.91 1019/1543 2.36 3.85 4.06 4.10 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 1 3 4 3 3.33 1449/1647 3.03 3.97 4.12 4.19 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 1 3 4 2 3.70 1249/1605 3.50 4.13 4.07 4.15 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 1 3 4 2 3.70 1249/1605 3.50 4.13 4.07 4.15 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 1 3 4 2 3.70 1249/1605 3.50 4.13 4.07 4.15 9. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 1 3 2 5 4.20 1118/1514 3.60 4.26 4.39 4.39 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 1 3 2 4 3.90 1118/1514 3.60 4.26 4.39 4.39 2. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 1 3 2 4 3.90 1174/1506 3.45 4.20 4.26 4.33 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0 0 2 2 1 7 4.30 414/1311 3.91 4.26 3.85 3.96 Piacutory 2 1 2 2 2 3 3 4 4.02 189/1499 3.74 4.17 4.05 4.11 2 3.04 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4	1 Did you gain new		Ω	Λ	2	Ω	3	4	5	3 71	1387/1669	3 56	4 26	4 23	4 34	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 6. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 7. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 8. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Laboratory 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions on the top that you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to			-	-	_	•	-	2	6							3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 4. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. O 0 1 0 6 6 4.31 13571668 4.27 4.62 4.67 4.59 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. Did the instructor's lectures 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. O 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0									1							3.75
6 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 4 3 3 3 3.8 1449/1647 3.03 3.97 4.12 4.19 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 1 0 6 6 4.31 1353/1668 4.27 4.62 4.67 4.59 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 1 1 0 6 6 6 4.31 1353/1668 4.27 4.62 4.67 4.59 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 1 3 4 2 3.70 1249/1605 3.50 4.13 4.07 4.15 Lecture Lecture Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 0 3 2 5 4.20 1118/1514 3.60 4.26 4.39 4.39 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 1193/1551 4.46 4.74 4.66 4.72 4.59 4.59 4.59 4.59 4.59 4.59 4.59 4.59			0			1	3	4	6							4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 4 3 3 3 3 3.38 1449/1647 3.03 3.97 4.12 4.19 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 1 0 6 6 6 4.31 1353/1668 4.27 4.62 4.67 4.59 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 1 3 4 2 3.70 1249/1605 3.50 4.13 4.07 4.15 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 0 3 2 5 4.20 1118/1514 3.60 4.26 4.39 4.39 4.39 2.01 dthe instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 1193/1551 4.66 4.74 4.66 4.72 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6 0 0 0 1 3 2 4 3.90 1174/1506 3.45 4.20 4.26 4.39 4.39 1.01 dthe lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 3 2 4 3.90 1174/1506 3.45 4.20 4.26 4.33 5.0 dthe instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 1 3 2 4 3.90 1174/1506 3.45 4.20 4.26 4.33 5.0 dthe lectures contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 3 2 4 3.90 1174/1506 3.45 4.20 4.26 4.33 5.0 dthe lectures contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 3 3 3 3 4.00 849/1490 3.74 4.17 4.05 4.11 3.01 dthe instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 2 3 4 4.22 936/1489 4.22 4.49 4.29 4.36 4.00 dthe instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 5 0 0 0 0 2 3 4 4.22 936/1489 4.22 4.49 4.29 4.36 4.00 dthe instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 5 0 0 0 0 2 3 4 4.22 936/1489 4.22 4.49 4.29 4.36 4.00 dthe lab instructor provide assistance 1 3 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			1	6	0	2	2	0	3	3.57	1192/1555	3.11	3.73	4.00	3.96	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 1 0 6 6 6 4.31 1353/1668 4.27 4.62 4.67 4.59 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 1 3 4 2 3.70 1249/1605 3.50 4.13 4.07 4.15 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 2 5 4.20 1118/1514 3.60 4.26 4.39 4.39 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 1193/1551 4.46 4.74 4.66 4.72 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 1193/1551 4.46 4.74 4.66 4.72 3. Was lecture scontribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 3 2 4 3.90 1174/1506 3.45 4.20 4.26 4.33 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0 0 1 3 2 4 3.90 1174/1506 3.45 4.20 4.26 4.33 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 1 3 3 3 4 4.00 849/1490 3.74 4.17 4.05 4.11 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 1 3 1 4 3.89 1129/1502 4.16 4.37 4.26 4.31 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 2 3 4 4.22 936/1489 4.22 4.49 4.29 4.36 4. Were special techniques successful 5 5 0 0 0 0 2 3 4 4.22 936/1489 4.22 4.49 4.29 4.36 5. Were you provided with adequate background information 5 5 0 0 0 0 2 3 4 4.22 936/1489 4.22 4.49 4.29 4.36 5. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 223 **** **** 4.50 4.74 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12 0 1 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 223 **** **** 4.50 4.74 6. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 223 **** **** 4.50 4.74 6. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 23 **** **** 4.50 4.74 6. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 23 **** **** 4.50 4.74 6. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	6. Did written assig	nments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0		4	4	3.91	1019/1543	2.36	3.85	4.06	4.10	3.91
Lecture Lect	7. Was the grading s	ystem clearly explained	1	0	-	_		3	3	3.38	1449/1647	3.03	3.97	4.12	4.19	3.38
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. 0 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 1193/1551 4.46 4.74 4.66 4.72 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Discussion Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Was level and subject Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion Did the lab instructor provide assistance Laboratory Did the lab instructor provide assistance Laboratory Did the lab instructor provide assistance 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 225 **** **** 4.19 4.36 *** Did the lab instructor provide assistance 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 225 **** **** 4.19 4.36 *** Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	-			-	-		-	-			,					4.31
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 1 3 2 5 4.20 1118/1514 3.60 4.26 4.39 4.39 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 1 3 3 6 4.50 1193/1551 4.46 4.74 4.66 4.72 4.29 4.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1	9. How would you gra	de the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1249/1605	3.50	4.13	4.07	4.15	3.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 1193/1551 4.46 4.74 4.66 4.72 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6 0 0 0 4 0 4 4.00 1066/1503 3.60 4.22 4.24 4.29 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 3 2 4 3.90 1174/1506 3.45 4.20 4.26 4.33 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0 0 2 2 0 1 7 4.30 414/1311 3.91 4.26 3.85 3.96 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 3 3 3 4.00 849/1490 3.74 4.17 4.05 4.11 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 1 3 1 4 3.89 1129/1502 4.16 4.37 4.26 4.31 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 2 3 4 4.22 936/1489 4.22 4.49 4.29 4.36 4. Were special techniques successful 5 5 0 2 1 0 1 3.00 923/1006 3.11 4.06 4.00 3.99 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 233 **** **** 4.19 4.36 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 225 **** **** 4.50 4.74 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 223 **** **** 4.50 4.74 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 223 **** **** 4.15 4.59 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 20 **** **** 4.15 4.59 **** Field Work 1. Did gield experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 52 **** 1.67 4.06 5.00 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 13 0 1 0 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.39 5.00 4.70 ***** 4.70 **** 4.70 **** 4.70 ***** 4.70 ***** 4.70 ***** 4.70 ***** 4.70 ***** 4.70 ***** 4.70 ***** 4.70 ***** 4.70 ***** 4.70 **** 4.70 ****** 4.70 ***** 4.70 ****** 4.70 ******* 4.70 ******* 4.70 ******* 4.70 ****** 4.70 ******		Lecture														
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 1 3 2 4 4.00 1066/1503 3.60 4.22 4.24 4.29 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 3 3 2 4 3.90 1174/1506 3.45 4.20 4.26 4.33 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0 0 2 0 1 7 4.30 414/1311 3.91 4.26 3.85 3.96 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 3 3 3 4.00 849/1490 3.74 4.17 4.05 4.11 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 1 3 1 4 3.89 1129/1502 4.16 4.37 4.26 4.31 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 2 3 4 4.22 936/1489 4.22 4.49 4.29 4.36 4. Were special techniques successful 5 5 0 2 1 0 1 3.00 923/1006 3.11 4.06 4.00 3.99 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 233 **** **** 4.19 4.36 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 225 **** **** 4.50 4.74 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 223 **** **** 4.15 4.59 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 23 **** **** 4.15 4.59 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			4	0			3	2	5	4.20	1118/1514	3.60	4.26	4.39	4.39	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 3 2 4 3.90 1174/1506 3.45 4.20 4.26 4.33 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0 0 2 0 1 7 4.30 414/1311 3.91 4.26 3.85 3.96 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 3 3 3 4.00 849/1490 3.74 4.17 4.05 4.11 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 1 3 1 4 3.89 1129/1502 4.16 4.37 4.26 4.31 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 2 3 4 4.22 936/1489 4.22 4.49 4.29 4.36 4. Were special techniques successful 5 5 0 2 1 0 1 3.00 923/1006 3.11 4.06 4.00 3.99 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 3.00 ****/ 233 **** **** 4.19 4.36 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 225 **** **** 4.35 4.71 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0.2.00 ****/ 223 **** **** 4.35 4.71 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 228 **** **** 4.15 4.59 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 58 **** 2.50 4.22 4.20 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 58 **** 4.39 5.00 4.74 4.75 6.00 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0.00 ****/ 58 **** **** 4.39 5.00 4.74 4.75 6.00 4.75 6.0	2. Did the instructo	r seem interested in the subject	4	-				3	6	4.50	1193/1551	4.46	4.74	4.66	4.72	4.50
Discussion Discussion Discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 1 3 3 3 4.00 849/1490 3.74 4.17 4.05 4.11 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 1 3 1 4 3.89 1129/1502 4.16 4.37 4.26 4.31 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 2 3 4 4.22 936/1489 4.22 4.49 4.29 4.36 4. Were special techniques successful 5 5 0 0 1 3 1 4 3.89 1129/1502 4.16 4.37 4.26 4.31 4. Were special techniques successful 5 5 0 0 1 3 1 4 3.89 1129/1502 4.16 4.37 4.26 4.31 4. Were special techniques successful 5 5 0 0 1 2 3 4 4.22 936/1489 4.22 4.49 4.29 4.36 4. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 0 1 0 0 2 10 0 0 3.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0								0	_							4.00
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned								2	_							3.90
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 3 3 3 4.00 849/1490 3.74 4.17 4.05 4.11 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 1 3 1 4 3.89 1129/1502 4.16 4.37 4.26 4.31 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 2 3 4 4.22 936/1489 4.22 4.49 4.29 4.36 4. Were special techniques successful 5 5 0 2 1 0 1 3.00 923/1006 3.11 4.06 4.00 3.99 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 233 **** **** 4.19 4.36 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 225 **** **** 4.50 4.74 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 223 **** **** 4.35 4.71 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 206 **** **** 4.15 4.59 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 58 **** 2.50 4.22 4.20 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 58 **** 2.50 4.22 4.20 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 59 **** 1.67 4.06 5.00 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 59 **** **** 3.97 5.00 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 55 **** 5.00 4.34 4.67	5. Did audiovisual t	echniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	2	0	1	7	4.30	414/1311	3.91	4.26	3.85	3.96	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 1 3 1 4 3.89 1129/1502 4.16 4.37 4.26 4.31 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 2 3 4 4.22 936/1489 4.22 4.49 4.29 4.36 4. Were special techniques successful 5 5 0 2 1 0 1 3.00 923/1006 3.11 4.06 4.00 3.99 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 233 **** **** 4.19 4.36 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 225 **** **** 4.50 4.74 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 223 **** **** 4.55 4.71 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 206 **** **** 4.15 4.59 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 25 **** 1.67 4.06 5.00 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 5.00 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 13 0 1 0 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 3.97 5.00 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 55 **** 5.00 4.34 4.67		Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 2 1 0 1 3.00 923/1006 3.11 4.06 4.00 3.99 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 233 **** **** 4.19 4.36 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 225 **** **** 4.50 4.74 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 223 **** **** 4.35 4.71 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 206 **** **** 4.15 4.59 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 58 **** 2.50 4.22 4.20 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 52 **** 1.67 4.06 5.00 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.39 5.00 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 13 0 1 0 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 3.97 5.00 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 55 **** 5.00 4.34 4.67	1. Did class discuss	ions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	849/1490	3.74	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.00
Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 233 **** **** 4.19 4.36 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 0 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 225 **** **** 4.50 4.74 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 223 **** **** 4.55 4.71 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 206 **** **** 4.15 4.59 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 58 **** 2.50 4.22 4.20 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 52 **** 1.67 4.06 5.00 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 5.00 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 13 0 1 0 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 3.97 5.00 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 55 **** 5.00 4.34 4.67									4	3.89	1129/1502	4.16	4.37	4.26	4.31	3.89
Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 233 **** **** 4.19 4.36 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 0 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 225 **** **** 4.50 4.74 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 223 **** **** 4.35 4.71 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 206 **** **** 4.15 4.59 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 58 **** 2.50 4.22 4.20 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 52 **** 1.67 4.06 5.00 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 5.00 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 13 0 1 0 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 3.97 5.00 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 55 **** 5.00 4.34 4.67									_				4.49	4.29	4.36	4.22
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 233 **** **** 4.19 4.36 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 225 **** **** 4.50 4.74 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 223 **** **** 4.35 4.71 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 206 **** **** 4.15 4.59 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 58 **** 2.50 4.22 4.20 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 52 **** 1.67 4.06 5.00 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 5.00 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 13 0 1 0 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 3.97 5.00 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 55 **** 5.00 4.34 4.67	4. Were special tech	niques successful	5	5	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	923/1006	3.11	4.06	4.00	3.99	3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 0 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 225 **** **** 4.50 4.74 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 223 **** **** 4.35 4.71 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 206 **** **** 4.15 4.59 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 58 **** 2.50 4.22 4.20 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 52 **** 1.67 4.06 5.00 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 5.00 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 13 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 3.97 5.00 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 55 **** 5.00 4.34 4.67		Laboratory														
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 223 **** **** 4.35 4.71 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 206 **** **** 4.15 4.59 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 58 **** 2.50 4.22 4.20 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 52 **** 1.67 4.06 5.00 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 5.00 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 13 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2. Were you provided	with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13. O O I O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O	3. Were necessary ma	terials available for lab activities	13	0	-		0	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 58 **** 2.50 4.22 4.20 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 52 **** 1.67 4.06 5.00 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 5.00 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 13 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 3.97 5.00 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 55 **** 5.00 4.34 4.67									-		,		****			****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 58 **** 2.50 4.22 4.20 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 52 **** 1.67 4.06 5.00 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 5.00 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 13 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 3.97 5.00 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 55 **** 5.00 4.34 4.67	5. Were requirements	for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 52 **** 1.67 4.06 5.00 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 5.00 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 13 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 3.97 5.00 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 55 **** 5.00 4.34 4.67		Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 5.00 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 13 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 3.97 5.00 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 55 **** 5.00 4.34 4.67			13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	2.50	4.22	4.20	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 13 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 3.97 5.00 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 55 **** 5.00 4.34 4.67								-	0		,		1.67			****
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 55 **** 5.00 4.34 4.67							-	•	0		,	****	****			****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 55 **** 5.00 4.34 4.67	4. To what degree co	uld you discuss your evaluations	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****
		Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 33 **** 5.00 4.25 5.00							-	-	•		,	****				****
	4. Was the feedback/	tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.25	5.00	****
Frequency Distribution		Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	7
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course Section: ART 213 0101 University of Maryland Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007

Instructor: DAVIS, PHIL

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 12

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 76

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque:	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	269/1669	3.92	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.75
2. Did the	e instruc	tor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	549/1666	3.59	4.18	4.19	4.29	4.50
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	3.00	4.47	4.24	4.35	****
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	219/1617	3.75	4.30	4.15	4.24	4.75
5. Did as	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	939/1555	2.79	3.73	4.00	3.96	3.91
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	250/1543	3.53	3.85	4.06	4.10	4.67
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	862/1647	3.41	3.97	4.12	4.19	4.25
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668	4.48	4.62	4.67	4.59	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	239/1605	3.58	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.67
		Lectur	ے															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	_	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	584/1514	3.81	4.26	4.39	4.39	4.67
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1551	4.74	4.74	4.66	4.72	5.00
				3	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	191/1503	3.82	4.22	4.24	4.29	4.83
	. Was lecture material presented and explained cle . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	2	9	4.82	273/1506	3.90	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.82
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understan						1	0	0	2	9	4.50	264/1311	4.19	4.26	3.85	3.96	4.50
		Discus																
1 543					_	0	0	1	0	2	4	4 00	040/1400	2 01	4 1 17	4 05	4 11	4 00
				what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	849/1490	3.81	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.00
		_	_	d to participate	2	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	846/1502	4.18	4.37	4.26	4.31	4.30
				d open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	500/1489	4.39	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.70
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssiul		2	6	0	0	0	U	4	5.00	1/1006	3.92	4.06	4.00	3.99	5.00
				Frequ	ency.	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	;	
												- 						
	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5							ed f	or Ma	jor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	12
	28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 56-83 5 2.00-2.99 3 C 1												1		_			
	56-83 5 2.00-2.99 3 C 1 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0						nera	T				0	Under-g	rad 1	2	Non-	-major	0
	= -								0			,						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		EΙ	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ın
				P 0 I 0							_		respons	es to b	e sign	ııtıcar	1t	
	Ot.	her				1	0											

Course Section: ART 213 0201 University of Maryland
Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D Baltimore County
Instructor: VAN GORDER, NEI Fall 2006

University of Maryland Page 77
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 14

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

		Ouestion	g		MD	NA		eque:			5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		_		Level Mean	
		Quescion	5 									Mean					Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	7	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	876/1669	3.92	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.29
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	7	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	1001/1666	3.59	4.18	4.19	4.29	4.14
		uations reflect			7		0	1	1	0	4	4.17	899/1617	3.75	4.30	4.15	4.24	4.17
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	7	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1555	2.79	3.73	4.00	3.96	****
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	6	5	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/1543	3.53	3.85	4.06	4.10	****
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	7	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	962/1647	3.41	3.97	4.12	4.19	4.14
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		7	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1144/1668	4.48	4.62	4.67	4.59	4.57
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	8	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	918/1605	3.58	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.00
		Lectur	е															
l. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	8	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1136/1514	3.81	4.26	4.39	4.39	4.17
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	954/1551	4.74	4.74	4.66	4.72	4.71
				xplained clearly	7	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	686/1503	3.82	4.22	4.24	4.29	4.43
. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	575/1506	3.90	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.57
. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	97/1311	4.19	4.26	3.85	3.96	4.86
		Discus	sion															
L. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1088/1490	3.81	4.17	4.05	4.11	3.67
. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	8	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	818/1502	4.18	4.37	4.26	4.31	4.33
. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	865/1489	4.39	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.33
. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		8	2	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	479/1006	3.92	4.06	4.00	3.99	4.00
		Labora	tory															
2. Were yo	ou provid	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
				Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	S			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 4		 Re	auir	ed f	 or M:	 aiors		0	Graduat		0	Majo	 or	4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 1			-1~) 0		-	or adda c	-	-			-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		50		_				_	011401 9		-	2.011		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		िन	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
oraa.	J	3.30 1.00	_	P 0		11						~	respons					
				I 0		O۲	her					6	T CPPOIIB		,c 5191.	ıııcaı	10	
				? 1		OL.	11CT					U						
				; T														

Course Section: ART 213 0301

VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D

Title

Instructor: BARBER, STEPHAN

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 78 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eane:	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_		4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	2	4	3		1550/1669		4.26	4.23	4.34	3.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	6	2		1516/1666	3.59	4.18	4.19	4.29	3.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	1	0	0		****/1421	3.00	4.47	4.24	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	1	2	1	4		1301/1617		4.30	4.15	4.24	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	0	4	1	0		1516/1555	2.79	3.73	4.00	3.96	2.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7 3	2 1	1 2	1 1	0 3	1		1522/1543		3.85	4.06	4.10	2.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		3 1	0	1	T	<i>3</i> 5	<i>3</i>		1393/1647			4.12	4.19 4.59	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	0	2	5 4	-		1370/1668 1274/1605			4.67		4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3		1	U	4	4	۷	3.07	12/4/1005	3.30	4.13	4.07	4.15	3.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	4	5		1136/1514			4.39	4.39	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	512/1551	4.74		4.66	4.72	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	2	4	2		1374/1503			4.24	4.29	3.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	2	4		1225/1506	3.90	4.20	4.26	4.33	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	414/1311	4.19	4.26	3.85	3.96	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	808/1490	3.81	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	978/1502	4.18	4.37	4.26	4.31	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	3	2	5		1038/1489	4.39	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	956/1006	3.92	4.06	4.00	3.99	2.75
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 112	****	4.63	4.38	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.36	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.75	4.20	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	2.50	4.22	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 52	***		4.06	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	***	5.00	4.34	4.67	****
		- D.	4		_									
Frequ	ıency	, DIS	trib	ut10	n									
0 11: 5 1 0 0 0 0				_					_					

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	

I 0 Other 10 ?

Course Section: ART 213 0401 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D

Instructor: BARBER, STEPHAN Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 14 Ouestionnaires: 12 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Ouestions Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 2 3 3.33 1542/1669 3.92 4.26 4.23 4.34 3.33 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 5 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 9 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 54 1 1 2.33 1648/1666 3.59 4.18 4.19 4.29 2.33 2 0 0 1 3.00 1357/1421 3.00 4.47 4.24 4.35 3.00 1 3 2 1 2.42 1598/1617 3.75 4.30 4.15 4.24 2.42 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 3 5 1 2 1 0 1.89 1550/1555 2.79 3.73 4.00 3.96 1.89 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 6 3 1 1 0 1.73 1633/1647 3.41 3.97 4.12 4.19 1.73 0 0 0 0 11 1 4.08 1487/1668 4.48 4.62 4.67 4.59 4.08 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 6 2 0 0 2 2.00 1585/1605 3.58 4.13 4.07 4.15 2.00

Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 5 3 2 0 2 2.25 1495/1514 3.81 4.26 4.39 4.39 2.25

Page JAN 18, 2007

2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 0 5 6 4.33 1304/1551 4.74 4.74 4.66 4.72 4.33 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 2 4 3 2 1 2.67 1458/1503 3.82 4.22 4.24 4.29 2.67 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 4 3 2 2 1 2.42 1468/1506 3.90 4.20 4.26 4.33 2.42

5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2 3 1 1 2 3 3.10 1104/1311 4.19 4.26 3.85 3.96 3.10

Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 2 2 3 3 3.45 1184/1490 3.81 4.17 4.05 4.11 3.45 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 1 0 2 3 5 4.00 1013/1502 4.18 4.37 4.26 4.31 4.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 1 3 7 4.55 648/1489 4.39 4.49 4.29 4.36 4.55

1 10 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1006 3.92 4.06 4.00 3.99 **** 4. Were special techniques successful

Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 11 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 226 **** **** 4.20 4.42 **** 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 233 **** **** 4.19 4.36 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0 0 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 225 **** **** 4.50 4.74 ****

4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 11 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 223 **** **** 4.35 4.71 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 11 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 206 **** 4.15 4.59 ****

Seminar 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 11 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.88 4.36 4.60 ****

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

 Course Section:
 ART 214 0101
 University of Maryland
 Page 80

 Title
 DRAWING I
 Baltimore County
 JAN 18, 2007

 Instructor:
 GARDNER, SYMMES
 Fall 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	12				
Questionnaires:	12	Student (Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

					Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	_	m this course	3	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	951/1669	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.22
		tor make clear			3	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	359/1666		4.18	4.19	4.29	4.67
		estions reflec			3	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	280/1421	4.75	4.47	4.24	4.35	4.75
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	3	0	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	717/1617	4.64	4.30	4.15	4.24	4.33
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to v	what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	584/1555	4.22	3.73	4.00	3.96	4.22
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	3	5	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	390/1543	4.50	3.85	4.06	4.10	4.50
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y expla:	ined	3	1	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	977/1647	4.15	3.97	4.12	4.19	4.13
8. How mar	ny times	was class canc	elled		5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1144/1668	4.34	4.62	4.67	4.59	4.57
9. How wou	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teacl	ning effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	789/1605	4.43	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.17
		Lectur	٩															
1 Were th	he instri	ctor's lecture		repared	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	505/1514	4.61	4.26	4.39	4.39	4.71
		tor seem inter	-		5	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	954/1551		4.74	4.66	4.72	4.71
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	686/1503	4.28	4.22	4.24	4.29	4.43
		es contribute t			5 5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	575/1506	4.35	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.57
			-	our understanding	5	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	189/1311		4.26	3.85		4.67
J. Dia aac	aiovibaai	ccciniiques cir	nance y	our understanding	3	_	J	J	_	Ü	,	1.07	105/1511	1.50	1.20	3.03	3.70	1.07
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	. ,		4.17	4.05	4.11	4.33
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	818/1502		4.37	4.26	4.31	4.33
		_		d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	348/1489	4.77	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.83
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		6	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1006	4.75	4.06	4.00	3.99	4.75
				Frequ	encv	Dist	tribu	ıt.i.oı	า									
				1					-									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А б		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 2			_											
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	neral	L				2	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0						Ele	ectiv	res				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
Р 0													respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	t	
I 0					Oth	ner					5							
? 0																		

Course Section: ART 214 0201 University of Maryland Page 81 Title DRAWING I Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 PENNY, JOHN E Instructor: Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Co	ourse 1	Evaluation	Questionnaire
------------	---------	------------	---------------

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

7

	Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	389/1669	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	549/1666	4.57	4.18	4.19	4.29	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1617	4.64	4.30	4.15	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1555	4.22	3.73	4.00	3.96	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1543	4.50	3.85	4.06	4.10	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1043/1647	4.15	3.97	4.12	4.19	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1329/1668	4.34	4.62	4.67	4.59	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	373/1605	4.43	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	955/1514	4.61	4.26	4.39	4.39	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	788/1551	4.79	4.74	4.66	4.72	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	719/1503	4.28	4.22	4.24	4.29	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	958/1506	4.35	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	389/1311	4.50	4.26	3.85	3.96	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	849/1490	4.06	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	754/1502	4.52	4.37	4.26	4.31	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	378/1489	4.77	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	4.75	4.06	4.00	3.99	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utio	n									

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

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

Fall 2006

PENNY, JOHN E Instructor: Enrollment: 11

Questionnaires: 11

Page 82 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

							Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights,ski		m this course	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	389/1669	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.67
_	_	tor make clear			2	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	494/1666	4.57	4.18	4.19	4.29	4.56
		ations reflect			2	4	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	394/1617	4.64	4.30	4.15	4.24	4.60
7. Was th	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	2	3	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	759/1647	4.15	3.97	4.12	4.19	4.33
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		2	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1470/1668	4.34	4.62	4.67	4.59	4.11
				hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	278/1605	4.43	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.63
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	505/1514	4.61	4.26	4.39	4.39	4.71
2. Did th	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	650/1551	4.79	4.74	4.66	4.72	4.86
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	4	0	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	1066/1503	4.28	4.22	4.24	4.29	4.00
4. Did th	e lecture	s contribute t	o what	you learned	4	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	884/1506	4.35	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.29
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	4	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1311	4.50	4.26	3.85	3.96	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	988/1490	4.06	4.17	4.05	4.11	3.83
2. Were a	ll studen	ts actively en	courage	d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	306/1502	4.52	4.37	4.26	4.31	4.83
3. Did th	e instruc	d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	532/1489	4.77	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.67		
4. Were s	. Were special techniques successful							0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	4.75	4.06	4.00	3.99	***
	Laboratory																	
				ground information	9	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 233		****	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were n	ecessary	materials avai	lable f	or lab activities	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	***
		Field																
				hat you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 58		2.50	4.22	4.20	****
2. Did yo	u clearly	understand yo	ur eval	uation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	1.67	4.06	5.00	****
		Self																
	_	-		what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 55		5.00	4.34	4.67	****
		ions make clea		_	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 42		5.00	4.31	5.00	****
_		cts with the i		_	9	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 46		5.00	4.45	5.00	****
		k/tutoring by	_	_	9	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 33		5.00	4.25	5.00	****
5. Were t	here enou	gh proctors fo	r all t	he students	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	5.00	****
	Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utior	ı												
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27						Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	 jors	 3	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 4			_			-						3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									3				-	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0						Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
				P 0							respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt			
I 0						Ot1	her					8						
? 0																		

Course Section: ART 215 0101

Title INTRO TO ART & MEDIA

Questions -----General

Instructor: DURANT, MARK

Enrollment: 120
Questionnaires: 82

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 83 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean

1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2 1	0 0 71 19 13 3 1 0	1 2 0 1 2 2 1 0 1	4 7 1 5 4 4 10 0	20 19 2 12 14 15 17 1	36 25 5 21 22 30 15 71 36	21 29 2 23 25 27 36 9 16	3.88 3.80 3.97 3.96 3.97 3.95 4.10	1307/1 1257/1 ****/1 1084/1 856/1 932/1 1113/1 1482/1 970/1	L666 L421 L617 L555 L543 L647	3.96 3.97 3.95 4.10	4.26 4.18 4.47 4.30 3.73 3.85 3.97 4.62 4.13	4.23 4.19 4.24 4.15 4.00 4.06 4.12 4.67 4.07	4.34 4.29 4.35 4.24 3.96 4.10 4.19 4.59 4.15	3.88 3.88 **** 3.97 3.96 3.97 3.95 4.10 3.97
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1 1 1 2 2	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 3 0	0 0 2 1 0	0 3 6		62 70 53 42 65	4.57 4.31	522/1 622/1 500/1 858/1 126/1	L551 L503 L506	4.86 4.57 4.31	4.26 4.74 4.22 4.20 4.26	4.24 4.26		
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	10 10 10 10	0 0 0 61	7 4 0 1	14 7 3 0	15 11 4 3	28 16 22 3	43	3.96 4.46	1278/1 1065/1 742/1 ****/1	L502 L489	3.96 4.46	4.17 4.37 4.49 4.06	4.26 4.29	4.31 4.36	3.22 3.96 4.46 ***
Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information	76	0	4	0	0	1	1	2.17	****/	233	***	****	4.19	4.36	***
Seminar 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	78 79	2 2	0	0	0	0	2 1		****/ ****/		* * * * * * * *	4.75	4.20 3.95	4.63 4.20	* * * * * * * *
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	77 78	0	2 2	0	2	0	1 1		****/ ****/	58 52	* * * * * * * *	2.50	4.22 4.06	4.20	****
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	78 78	0	2	0	0	0	2 1		****/ ****/		* * * * * * * *	5.00 5.00	4.34 4.31	4.67 5.00	* * * * * * * *
Freq	uency	Dist	trib	outio	n										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	s				Тур	e			Majors	
00-27 9 0.00-0.99 0 A 48 28-55 13 1.00-1.99 0 B 24 56-83 9 2.00-2.99 2 C 0 84-150 10 3.00-2.99 11 D 0		Ger	- nera	ıl	or M	ajor		0	Unde	duate	ad 8	0		major	42
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 21 F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 0			ecti her	ves				9				chere a pe sign		_	11

Course Section: ART 220 0101 Title ART HISTORY I

Instructor: FELDMAN, JOAN

Enrollment: 113
Questionnaires: 73

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 84 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	11	22	37	4.31	852/1669	4.31	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	24	41	4.46	620/1666	4.46	4.18	4.19	4.29	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	0	17	53	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.47	4.24	4.35	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	10	30	29	4.28	780/1617	4.28	4.30	4.15	4.24	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	8	1	7	9	18	28	4.03	753/1555	4.03	3.73	4.00	3.96	4.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	5	3	4	13	22	23	3.89	1027/1543	3.89	3.85	4.06	4.10	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	4	6	18	43	4.41	651/1647	4.41	3.97	4.12	4.19	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	65	4.92	641/1668	4.92	4.62	4.67	4.59	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	2	0	1	6	37	11	4.05	884/1605	4.05	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	10	58	4.80	360/1514		4.26	4.39	4.39	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	4	66	4.90	512/1551	4.90	4.74	4.66	4.72	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	6	23	40	4.46	637/1503	4.46	4.22	4.24	4.29	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	4	13	52	4.62	534/1506	4.62	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	6	9	55	4.70	174/1311	4.70	4.26	3.85	3.96	4.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	4	2	9	4	27	4.04	832/1490	4.04	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.04
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	3	11	12	21	4.09	982/1502	4.09	4.37	4.26	4.31	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	1	1	8	16	20	4.15	980/1489	4.15	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.15
4. Were special techniques successful	26	28	4	0	5	7	3	3.26	869/1006	3.26	4.06	4.00	3.99	3.26
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	65	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	67	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	68	1	1	0	0	3	0		****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	68	4	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	67	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	65	4	0	0	0	1	3		****/ 112	****	4.63	4.38	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	66	2	0	0	0	2	3		****/ 97	****	4.88	4.36	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	66	3	1	0	0	3	0		****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	66	4	0	0	0	3	0		****/ 105	****	4.75	4.20	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	65	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	66	0	2	1	0	2	2	3.14	****/ 58	****	2.50	4.22	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	66	0	1	1	1	1	3		****/ 52	****	1.67	4.06	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	66	5	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	67 66	3	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****
. Did conferences help you carry out field activities		5	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	68	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	68	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	68	4	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	68	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.25	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	68	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	5.00	****

Course Section: ART 220 0101
Title ART HISTORY I
Instructor: FELDMAN, JOAN
Enrollment: 113

Questionnaires: 73

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 84 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	2	A	42	Required for Majors	33	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	В	18						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	8	C	6	General	8	Under-grad	73	Non-major	53
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	2						

Course Section: ART 221 0101 University of Maryland Title ART HISTORY II Baltimore County

Instructor: OTTESEN, BODIL Fall 2006

Enrollment: 114 Questionnaires: 109

Page 85 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Ctudant	('Ollred	Evaluation	Ollegtion	n n n n n

				Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1	. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	33	0	1	6	21	31	17	3.75	1371/1669	3.75	4.26	4.23	4.34	3.75
2	. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	33	0	5	8	25	22	16	3.47	1479/1666	3.47	4.18	4.19	4.29	3.47
3	. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	33	0	6	7	18	24	21	3.62	1185/1421	3.62	4.47	4.24	4.35	3.62
4	. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	33	4	6	9	15	31	11	3.44	1403/1617	3.44	4.30	4.15	4.24	3.44
5	. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	35	2	2	3	19	25	23	3.89	955/1555	3.89	3.73	4.00	3.96	3.89
6	. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	35	1	7	5	23	27	11	3.41	1298/1543	3.41	3.85	4.06	4.10	3.41
7	. Was the grading system clearly explained	36	0	3	9	20	25	16	3.58	1365/1647	3.58	3.97	4.12	4.19	3.58
8	. How many times was class cancelled	35	0	0	0	1	1	72	4.96	357/1668	4.96	4.62	4.67	4.59	4.96
9	. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	44	2	1	1	24	32	5	3.62	1305/1605	3.62	4.13	4.07	4.15	3.62
	Lecture														
1	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	36	0	0	4	9	23	37	4.27	1070/1514	4.27	4.26	4.39	4.39	4.27
2	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	35	0	0	0	4	9	61	4.77	843/1551	4.77	4.74	4.66	4.72	4.77
3	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	36	0	3	3	12	30	25	3.97	1096/1503	3.97	4.22	4.24	4.29	3.97
4	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	4	13	18	39	4.24	917/1506	4.24	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.24
5	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	35	2	6	3	9	17	37	4.06	562/1311	4.06	4.26	3.85	3.96	4.06
	Discussion														
1	. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	47	0	25	6	8	9	14	2.69	1414/1490	2.69	4.17	4.05	4.11	2.69
2	. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	47	0	21	10	19	10	2	2.39	1484/1502	2.39	4.37	4.26	4.31	2.39
3	. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	47	0	17	12	15	10	8	2.68	1452/1489	2.68	4.49	4.29	4.36	2.68
4	. Were special techniques successful	46	52	2	1	4	4	0	2.91	****/1006	****	4.06	4.00	3.99	****
	Laboratory														
1	. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	95	11	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	***
2	. Were you provided with adequate background information	99	0	2	2	2	3	1	2.90	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
3	. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	100	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****
4	. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	100	6	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****
5	. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	99	7	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****
	Seminar														
1	. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	96	7	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	****/ 112	****	4.63	4.38	4.59	****
2	. Was the instructor available for individual attention	95	5	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.36	4.60	****
3	. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	97	5	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.50	****
4	. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	96	7	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/ 105	****	4.75	4.20	4.63	****
5	. Were criteria for grading made clear	96	6	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	***
	Field Work														
1	. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	99	0	3	1	3	2	1	2.70	****/ 58	****	2.50	4.22	4.20	****
2	. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	98	0	2	2	3	3	1	2.91	****/ 52	****	1.67	4.06	5.00	****
3	. Was the instructor available for consultation	97	5	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****
4	. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	98	7	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****
5	. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	98	7	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****
	Self Paced														
	. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	98	0	2	0	5	2	2	3.18	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.67	****
	. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	96	7	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****
3	. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	96	8	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****
	. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	97	9	0	1	0	1	1		****/ 33	****	5.00	4.25	5.00	****
5	. Were there enough proctors for all the students	97	9	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	5.00	****

Course Section: ART 221 0101
Title ART HISTORY II
Instructor: OTTESEN, BODIL
Enrollment: 114

Questionnaires: 109

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 85 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	 А	15	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	1	Major	5
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	В	37						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	12	General	11	Under-grad	108	Non-major	104
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	11	D	2						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Mean	s there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	o be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	2						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course Section: ART 275 0101 Title INTRO TO PRINTMAKING Fall 2006 Instructor: BOWLER, RUTH S Enrollment:

Page 86 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	9		
Questionnaires:	9	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	e

?

0

							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	- lls fro	m this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	151/1669	4.88	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.88
		ctor make clear			2	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	472/1666	4.57	4.18	4.19	4.29	4.57
		uestions reflec			1	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.35	****
4. Did ot	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	1	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	424/1617	4.57	4.30	4.15	4.24	4.57
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1555	****	3.73	4.00	3.96	****
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1543	****	3.85	4.06	4.10	****
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	862/1647	4.25	3.97	4.12	4.19	4.25
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.59	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	170/1605	4.75	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.75
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	505/1514	4.71	4.26	4.39	4.39	4.71
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	491/1503	4.57	4.22	4.24	4.29	4.57
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	225/1506	4.86	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.86
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	1	2	1	0	0	3	3.17	1084/1311	3.17	4.26	3.85	3.96	3.17
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	445/1490	4.50	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.50
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.37	4.26	4.31	5.00
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.36	5.00
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		5	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1006	****	4.06	4.00	3.99	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Re	quir	ea i	or Ma	ljors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5		~		,				-	1	,	0			-
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	T				1	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0								0			,			,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ın
				P 0								-	respons	es to b	e sign	uiicar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot.	her					5						

Course Section: ART 305 0101 University of Maryland Page 87 Title FILM I: MOVING IMAGES Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007

Instructor: WORDEN, FRED

Instructor: WORDEN, FR Enrollment: 11

Questionnaires: 10

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	143/1669	4.89	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.89
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	118/1666	4.89	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.89
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.47	4.24	4.25	4.67
4. Did ot	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	1	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	219/1617	4.75	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.75
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	2	3	3.44	1272/1555	3.44	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.44
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	659/1543	4.25	3.85	4.06	4.14	4.25
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	123/1647	4.89	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.89
8. How max	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	157/1605	4.78	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.78
		Lectur																
		uctor's lecture			1	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	892/1514	4.44	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.44
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.70	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	254/1503	4.78	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.78
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.20	4.26	4.30	5.00
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	86/1311	4.89	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.89
		Discus																
				what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	298/1490	4.71	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.71
				d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	286/1502	4.86	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.86
		_		d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.35	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		3	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	669/1006	3.71	4.06	4.00	4.10	3.71
				Frequ	ency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	 guir	ed f	or Ma	aior:	 S	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3						J ·						3 -		-
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Gei	nera	1				2	Under-q	rad 1	.0	Non-	-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0									5					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	_f h
				P 0									respons				_	•
				I O		Ot1	her					5			5			
												-						

0

Baltimore County

Course Section: ART 315 0101

VIDEO I

10

GRABILL, VIN

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Page 88 JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	eanei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	-	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	Ω	1	1	Λ	4	1	3 43	1516/1669	3.43	4 26	4 23	4.28	3.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	0	3	3		1094/1666		4.18	4.19	4.20	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	1	0	3	1		1357/1421		4.47	4.24	4.25	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	3	2	1		1301/1617		4.30	4.15	4.22	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	0	3	1		1427/1555		3.73	4.00	4.03	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	1	0	0	0	0		****/1543		3.85	4.06	4.14	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	5	1		1043/1647		3.97	4.12	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	6		807/1668		4.62	4.67	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1312/1605	3.60	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1295/1514	3.83	4.26	4.39	4.46	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	705/1551	4.83	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1380/1503	3.33	4.22	4.24	4.28	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	1361/1506	3.33	4.20	4.26	4.30	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	1	0	0	4	3.83	744/1311	3.83	4.26	3.85	3.97	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	988/1490	3.83	4.17	4.05	4.11	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	306/1502	4.83	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	348/1489	4.83	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.83
Frequ	ency	Dis	rib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	ı

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	9	Non-major	6
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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				2	0						

Course Section: ART 323 0101

Title 20TH CENTURY ART

Instructor: MAHONEY, JAMES

Enrollment: 46

Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 89 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General				_										
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	23	0	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	404/1669	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	23	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	483/1666	4.63	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	23	1	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	318/1421	4.72	4.47	4.24	4.25	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	24	6	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	370/1617	4.56	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	23	1	2	0	5	6	9	3.91	939/1555	4.20	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	22	3	0	0	4	4	13	4.43	490/1543	4.40	3.85	4.06	4.14	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	23	0	0	2	2	4	15	4.39	666/1647	4.47	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	23	1 1	0	0 1	0 1	10	12		1164/1668	4.75	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	Т	U	Т	Т	3	13	4.56	335/1605	4.60	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	257/1514	4.88	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1551	4.95	4.74	4.66	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	254/1503	4.80	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	212/1506	4.85	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	1	0	0	2	1	18	4.76	137/1311		4.26	3.85	3.97	4.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	2	1	3	2	7	3.73	1049/1490	4.14	4.17	4.05	4.11	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	4	2	1	3	8	3.50	1301/1502	3.99	4.37	4.26	4.28	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	0	0	2	4			730/1489	4.61	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.47
4. Were special techniques successful	31	12	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1006	4.60	4.06	4.00	4.10	****
T alassahassa														
Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	1	0	0	3	0	2 25	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	U	Τ	U	U	3	U	3.45	/ 233			4.19	4.13	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.63	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.75	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	2.50	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	1.67	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	5.00	4.34	4.03	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.45	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 29	****	5.00	4.23	4.13	****
5. Here there though process for all the students	13	0	J	J	J	0	_	3.00	, 25		3.00	1.51	1.13	

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

MAHONEY, JAMES

Enrollment: 46 Questionnaires: 46 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 89 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	46	Non-major	37
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Course Section: ART 323 0102 University of Maryland 20TH CENTURY ART Instructor: JACOB, PREMINDA

Title

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 90

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 41 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

4.28 4.69 4.20 4.69 4.25 4.71 4.22 4.50 4.03 4.48		Mean	Mean	Rank	τ.					_				
4.20 4.69 4.25 4.71 4.22 4.50 4.03 4.48	4.23 4.				1	Mean	5	4	3	2	1	NA	NR	Questions
4.20 4.69 4.25 4.71 4.22 4.50 4.03 4.48	4.23 4.													General
4.20 4.69 4.25 4.71 4.22 4.50 4.03 4.48	4.23 4.	4.26	4.67	60/1669	260	4.69	22	5	2	0	0	0	12	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course
4.25 4.71 4.22 4.50 4.03 4.48	4.19 4.	4.18	4.63	32/1666		4.69	22	5	2	0	0	0	12	. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals
4.22 4.50 4.03 4.48		4.47	4.72	31/1421		4.71	23	3	1	1	0	1	12	. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals
4.03 4.48		4.30	4.56	96/1617		4.50	18	6	4	0	0	1	12	. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals
		3.73	4.20	59/1555		4.48	20	5	3	0	1	0	12	. Did other evaluations refrect the expected goars . Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned
4.14 4.38		3.85	4.40	43/1543		4.38	16	8	5	0	0	0	12	. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned
		3.97	4.47	24/1647		4.55	20	5	4	0	0	0	12	. Was the grading system clearly explained
		4.62	4.75	85/1668		4.96	27	1	0	0	0	1	12	. How many times was class cancelled
		4.13	4.60	68/1605		4.64	15	6	1	0	0	0	19	. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness
				,										·
														Lecture
		4.26		06/1514		4.90	26	3	0	0	0	0	12	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared
		4.74	4.95	39/1551		4.90	27	1	1	0	0	0	12	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject
		4.22	4.80	01/1503		4.83	24	5	0	0	0	0	12	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly
		4.20	4.85	61/1506		4.83	25	3	1	0	0	0	12	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned
3.97 4.81	3.85 3.	4.26	4.79	12/1311	112	4.81	23	3	1	0	0	0	14	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding
														Discussion
4.11 4.54	4.05 4.	4.17	4.14	22/1490	422	4.54	15	8	0	1	0	0	17	. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned
4.28 4.48	4.26 4.	4.37	3.99	68/1502	668	4.48	14	6	3	0	0	0	18	. Were all students actively encouraged to participate
4.35 4.75	4.29 4.	4.49	4.61	34/1489	434	4.75	18	6	0	0	0	0	17	. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion
4.10 4.60	4.00 4.	4.06	4.60	99/1006	199	4.60	14	4	2	0	0	4	17	. Were special techniques successful
														Seminar
4.53 ****	4.38 4.	4.63	****	**/ 112	***	5 00	1	0	0	0	0	0	40	. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme
			****				1							5 1
			****	,			1							
			****	,			1	-						
		4.00	****	,		5.00	1	0	0	0	0	0	40	
									n	ution	crib	Dist	ency	Freq
Majors	Maj		рe	Тур				:	asons	Rea				redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades
or 16	Maior	0		 Graduat <i>e</i>	رے. دے	3		ior	 or Ma	ed fo	 mii r	Red		00-27 1 0 00-0 99 0 2 11
01 10	110,01	•	_		01	-	~	. , 🔾 - 1	J_ 110	- A - L	1411	1000		
-major 25	Non-maj	1	rad 4	Under-ar	IJr	5				1	nera	Gei		
	1.011	-			51	-				_	a			
t enough	are not en	here a	Means t	#### - N	##	1				ves	ecti	Ele		Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0
_	nificant													P 0
-			D		- `	8	1				ner	Ot.1		I 0
							_							? 0
N Oi	4.36 4.22 4.20 3.95 Major Non-mare not	4.88 5.00 4.75 4.00	**** *** *** pe e rad 4	**/ 97 **/ 92 **/ 105 **/ 98 Typ Graduate Under-gr	**** **** **** G1	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	1 	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 ution Read 	0 0 0 0 crib	0 0 0 0 Dist	40 40 40 40	. Was the instructor available for individual attention . Did research projects contribute to what you learned . Did presentations contribute to what you learned . Were criteria for grading made clear Freq redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades

Course Section: ART 324 0101 University of Maryland
Title HISTORY OF FILM TO 196 Baltimore County

TO 196 Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN Enrollment: 61

Questionnaires: 38

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 91

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque	ncie	:S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	v insights,skills fr	om this course	6	0	2	1	7	15	7	3.75	1371/1669	3.75	4.26	4.23	4.28	3.75
2. Did the instruct	or make clear the e	xpected goals	6	0	0	5	12	8	7	3.53	1455/1666	3.53	4.18	4.19	4.20	3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals					0	0	8	10	14	4.19	871/1421	4.19	4.47	4.24	4.25	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals					0	1	3	2	3	3.78	****/1617	****	4.30	4.15	4.22	****
5. Did assigned rea	6	0	1	1	11	13	6	3.69	1118/1555	3.69	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.69		
6. Did written assi	to what you learned	6	23	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	****/1543	****	3.85	4.06	4.14	***	
7. Was the grading	system clearly expl	ained	6	2	0	2	6	5	17	4.23	885/1647	4.23	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.23
8. How many times w	. How many times was class cancelled					0	0	16	15	4.38	1297/1668	4.38	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left($					0	0	6	18	3	3.89	1108/1605	3.89	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.89
Lecture																
1. Were the instruc	ctor's lectures well	prepared	7	0	0	0	2	8	21	4.61	663/1514	4.61	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.61
2. Did the instruct	or seem interested	in the subject	6	0	0	1	0	7	24	4.69	1000/1551	4.69	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.69
	erial presented and	_	8	0	0	0	2	12	16	4.47	621/1503	4.47	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.47
4. Did the lectures	s contribute to what	you learned	7	0	1	2	4	8	16	4.16	980/1506	4.16	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.16
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	7	0	0	0	1	4	26	4.81	116/1311	4.81	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.81
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	ssions contribute to	what you learned	20	0	7	4	2	2	3	2.44	1440/1490	2.44	4.17	4.05	4.11	2.44
	s actively encourage	-	20	0	8	2	5	0	3	2.33	1486/1502	2.33	4.37	4.26	4.28	2.33
			20	0	4	1	6	4	3	3.06	1395/1489	3.06	4.49	4.29	4.35	3.06
 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion Were special techniques successful 				14	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1006	****	4.06	4.00	4.10	****
		Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Re	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 4	 Δ 13		Re			N	 Ia ior		0	Graduat		0	Maic	~~~~~	13	

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	13	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	10	Under-grad	38	Non-major	25
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				?	1						

Course Section: ART 326 0101 University of Maryland Title HIST. OF PHOTOGRAPHY I

STEPHANY, JAROM

Instructor:

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 92

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 30 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions					NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera																
		ew insights,ski			13	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	864/1669		4.26	4.23	4.28	4.29
		ctor make clear	_	_	13 13	0 0	0	1	2	9	5		1065/1666		4.18	4.19	4.20	4.06
	3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals						1	0	4	2	10	4.18	878/1421		4.47	4.24	4.25	4.18
	4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned						0	0	3	6	7	4.25	801/1617	4.25	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.25
					13	2	0	0	5	4	6	4.07	734/1555		3.73	4.00	4.03	4.07
				what you learned	13	0	0	0	5	4	8	4.18	747/1543		3.85	4.06	4.14	4.18
		g system clearly		ined	13 13	0	0	0	4	_	10		- ,		3.97	4.12	4.14	
	8. How many times was class cancelled						0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1668		4.62	4.67	4.68	
9. How wo	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness					0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	769/1605	4.18	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.18
	Lecture																	
1 Wassa 5	1 4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.75	441/1514	4 75	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.75				
 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 					14 14	0	0	0	0		12 15	4.75	441/1514 358/1551			4.39	4.46	4.75
					14	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44				4.24	4.70	4.44
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56			4.22	4.24	4.20	4.44
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				14 13	0	1	0	1	2	12	4.47	284/1311			3.85	3.97	
5. Did au	laiovisua.	r teciniiques em	nance yo	our understanding	13	U	1	U	Τ	3	12	4.4/	204/1311	4.4/	4.20	3.05	3.97	4.4/
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	21	0	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	965/1490	3.89	4.17	4.05	4.11	3.89
				to participate	21	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	968/1502		4.37	4.26	4.28	4.11
				d open discussion	21	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	753/1489		4.49	4.29	4.35	4.44
		echniques succes		open arboabbron	21	4	0	0	2	0	3		****/1006		4.06	4.00	4.10	****
	F	1											,					
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	ıtioı	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	ре			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	`====	7	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 7			_			-								
56-83						Gei	nera:	L				1	Under-g	rad 3	0	Non-	major	29
84-150	34-150 3 3.00-3.49 3 D 0												_				-	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0						Ele	ecti	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0	Other						5							
				3 0														

Course Section: ART 331 0101 University of Mary:
Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I Baltimore County
Instructor: APOSTOLIDES, HE Fall 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 10

13

University of Maryland Page 93
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Fireliation	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

					Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	t UMBC Leve		Sect	
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	590/1669	3.94	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.50
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	319/1666	4.11	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.70
		estions reflec			0	6	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.47	4.24	4.25	5.00
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	288/1617	4.23	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.70
5. Did as	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1555	4.67	3.73	4.00	4.03	****
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	481/1647	4.05	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.50
8. How ma	How many times was class cancelled					0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1190/1668	4.60	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.50
9. How wo	. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness $% \left(x\right) =\left(x\right) +\left(x\right) $					1	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1132/1605	3.66	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.86
	Lecture																	
1. Were t	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	2	0	7	4.56	739/1514	4.14	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.56
2. Did th	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1551	4.77	4.74	4.66	4.70	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	510/1503	3.87	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.56
4. Did th	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	2	7	4.78	326/1506	3.91	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.78
5. Did au	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						1	0	2	0	2	3.40	995/1311	3.86	4.26	3.85	3.97	3.40
	Discussion																	
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	372/1490	4.16	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.63
2. Were a	ıll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	2	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	880/1502	4.26	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.25
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	309/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.88
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful	_	1	5	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	657/1006	3.87	4.06	4.00	4.10	3.75
		Semina	r															
4. Did pr	esentatio	ons contribute	to what	you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.75	4.20	4.45	****
		Field	Work															
4. To wha	ıt degree	could you disc	uss you	r evaluations	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
		Self	Paced															
				what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.03	****
3. Were y	our conta	acts with the i	nstruct	or helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.13	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27 28-55	1 1	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	A 7 B 1		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	4
28-55 56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Cor	neral	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non	-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		Gei	ıcı a.	_				U	onder -g.	Luu 1	. 0	INOII-	ilia JUI	U
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	Б 0 F 0		בוק	ectiv	760				0	#### - 1	Meane +	here =	re not	enouc	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	_	P 0		11.17	-CC1	v CD				J	respons				-	1++
				I O		Other						8	1 0550115		5191			
				- •		001						-						

? 0

Course Section: ART 331 0201

Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I Instructor: LENZER, JANET

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 94 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------------	--------------	---------------

			Fre	Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	734/1669	3.94		4.23	4.28	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	814/1666	4.11	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	750/1617	4.23	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	225/1555	4.67	3.73	4.00	4.03	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1543	****	3.85	4.06	4.14	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	992/1647	4.05	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1125/1668	4.60	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	840/1605	3.66	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	715/1514	4.14	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	843/1551	4.77	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	1176/1503	3.87	4.22	4.24	4.28	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	1017/1506	3.91	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	97/1311	3.86	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.86
Discussion														
	-1	_	^	-1	1	2	4	4 11	000/1400	1 10	4 1 7	4 05	1 11	4 11
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.11	800/1490	4.16	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	-	-	1	-	2	6	4.44	705/1502	4.26	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	865/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	U	0	1	2	4	4.43	292/1006	3.87	4.06	4.00	4.10	4.43
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.27	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.63	4.38	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.75	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	2.50	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	50/ 52	1.67	1.67	4.06	3.59	1.67
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4 00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.03	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.03	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.45	3.00	****
4. was the reemback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	Т	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	/ 33		3.00	4.43	3.00	

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

I 0 Other 8 ? 0

Course Section: ART 331 0301 University of Maryland GRAPHIC DESIGN I Baltimore County LENZER, JANET

Fall 2006

Instructor:	LENZ
Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	15

Title

Page 95 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Frequencies						ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	2	2	5	2	2.93	1610/1669	3.94	4.26	4.23	4.28	2.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	4	2	5	3.33	1527/1666	4.11	4.18	4.19	4.20	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1421	5.00	4.47	4.24	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	0	4	1	6	3.69	1284/1617	4.23	4.30	4.15	4.22	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	12	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1555	4.67	3.73	4.00	4.03	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	1	2	4	4	3.54	1381/1647	4.05	3.97	4.12	4.14	3.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	1017/1668	4.60	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	1	3	3	1	3.00	1501/1605	3.66	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	4	3	3	3.31	1424/1514	4.14	4.26	4.39	4.46	3.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	1168/1551	4.77	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	0	6	0	4	3.15	1409/1503	3.87	4.22	4.24	4.28	3.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	6	1	2	2.85	1427/1506	3.91	4.20	4.26	4.30	2.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	2	0	3	1	3	3.33	1027/1311	3.86	4.26	3.85	3.97	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	2	3	5	3.75	1036/1490	4.16	4.17	4.05	4.11	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	3	1	7	4.08	982/1502		4.37	4.26	4.28	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			0	0	4	5	3		1116/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.35	3.92
4. Were special techniques successful		0 5	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	799/1006	3.87	4.06	4.00	4.10	3.43
4. Were special techniques successium			-	=	-		_		,					

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				2	0						

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Course Section: ART 332 0101

11

GRAPHIC DESIGN II

CUSTEN, CALVIN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland

Page 96

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

			Fr	Frequencies				Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1307/1669	3.81	4.26	4.23	4.28	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1334/1666	3.44	4.18	4.19	4.20	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	496/1617	3.95	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	1187/1647	3.79	3.97	4.12	4.14	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	1464/1668	4.31	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	4	0	3.57	1325/1605	3.71	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	3	3	0	3.13	1446/1514	3.25	4.26	4.39	4.46	3.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1338/1551	4.44	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	3	2	0	2.88	1439/1503	3.25	4.22	4.24	4.28	2.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	6	1	1	3.38	1353/1506	3.69	4.20	4.26	4.30	3.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	875/1311	3.74	4.26	3.85	3.97	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	849/1490	3.92	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.00
_		0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	818/1502		4.17	4.05	4.11	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	U T	2	3	4.50	,		4.37	4.20	4.28	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	0	3	3							4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	Τ	U	U	U	U	1.00	****/1006	^ ^ ~	4.06	4.00	4.10	
Frequ	encv	Dist	-rib	utio	n									

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

University of Maryland Page 97
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaire

Course Section: ART 332 0102

11

GRAPHIC DESIGN II

CUSTEN, CALVIN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

					Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	.s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	1371/1669	3.81	4.26	4.23	4.28	3.75
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	2	2	1	2		1565/1666		4.18	4.19	4.20	3.13
		uestions reflec			1	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.25	****
	_	uations reflect		_	1	2	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1425/1617	3.95	4.30	4.15	4.22	3.40
				what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.73	4.00	4.03	4.00
				o what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1543	****	3.85	4.06	4.14	****
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	1	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1295/1647	3.79	3.97	4.12	4.14	3.71
8. How ma	ny times		0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1190/1668	4.31	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.50		
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1132/1605	3.71	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.86	
		Lectur																
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	3	2	0	3	3.38	1412/1514	3.25	4.26	4.39	4.46	3.38
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	1	1			1083/1551			4.66	4.70	4.63
				explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1293/1503	3.25	4.22	4.24	4.28	3.63
		es contribute t			0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1069/1506	3.69	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.00
				our understanding	0	1	0	1	1	3			731/1311			3.85	3.97	3.86
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	988/1490	3.92	4.17	4.05	4.11	3.83
				d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	5		306/1502		4.37	4.26	4.28	4.83
				d open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67			4.49	4.29	4.35	4.67
		echniques succe		-	2	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	***	4.06	4.00	4.10	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ation	n									
a 1'. =					_			_					_					
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3 			Ту	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	0	A 3		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors		0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	8		
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	l				0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	0
84-150	1																	
Grad. $0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0$						Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0	Other							7						

? 0

Course Section: ART 333 0101 University of Maryland Page 98
Title GRAPHIC DESIGN III Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Instructor: CAMPBELL, SUSAN Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 13

? 0

								eque:		s			ructor	Course	-		Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	647/1669	4.58	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.46
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	908/1666		4.18	4.19	4.20	4.23
		uestions reflec			0	1	0	0	2	3	7	4.42			4.47	4.24	4.25	4.42
	_	uations reflect		_	0	1	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	801/1617	4.47	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.25
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	4	3	3.69	1111/1555	3.85	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.69
6. Did wr	ritten as:	o what you learned	0	11	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1543	3.80	3.85	4.06	4.14	****		
7. Was th	ne grading	0	0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	1137/1647	4.08	3.97	4.12	4.14	3.92			
8. How ma	any times		0	0	0	0	0	12	1	4.08	1492/1668	4.08	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.08		
		hing effectiveness	0	0	0	1	5	6	1	3.54	1343/1605	3.87	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.54		
1 Wassa +	.b	Lectur uctor's lecture			2	0	0	0	1	4	_	4 40	055/1514	4.51	4.26	4 20	1 10	4.40
		ctor's lecture			3	0	0	0 1	1	4	5 5		955/1514 1361/1551		4.26	4.39	4.46	4.40
				n the subject xplained clearly	3	0	0		1	3 4	5 5		,		4.74	4.00	4.70	
		teriai presente es contribute t			3	0	0	1	2	2	5 5		1025/1506		4.22	4.24	4.28	4.40
				you learned our understanding	3	9	0	0	∠ 1	0	0		****/1311		4.26	3.85	3.97	4.1U ****
5. Did au	latovisua.	i techniques en	nance y	our understanding	3	9	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	^^^/1311	4.1/	4.20	3.85	3.97	
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	849/1490	4.18	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.00
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	4	0	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	1253/1502	4.06	4.37	4.26	4.28	3.67
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	5	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	1137/1489	4.16	4.49	4.29	4.35	3.88
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		5	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1006	3.75	4.06	4.00	4.10	****
				Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	utio:	n									
a 1'. =		a ana			_			_					_					
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason 	s 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	0	A 8		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajors		0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	12		
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 3														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3.00-3.49 2 D 0															
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0						Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
P 0													respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
I 0						Otl	ner				1	1						

Course Section: ART 333 0201 University of Maryland Page 99
Title GRAPHIC DESIGN III Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Instructor: CAMPBELL, SUSAN Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questionnaires: 13

		Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	345/1669	4.58	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	549/1666	4.37	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	356/1421	4.55	4.47	4.24	4.25	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	288/1617	4.47	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	773/1555	3.85	3.73	4.00	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1101/1543	3.80	3.85	4.06	4.14	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	7	5	4.23	885/1647	4.08	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	1		1492/1668	4.08	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	759/1605	3.87	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	663/1514	4.51	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	1097/1551	4.41	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	621/1503	4.43	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	693/1506	4.28	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	501/1311	4.17	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	594/1490	4.18	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	693/1502	4.06	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	742/1489	4.16	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	2	0	0	2	4	3.75	657/1006	3.75	4.06	4.00	4.10	3.75

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55 56-83	0 4	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0 0	B C	3	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F P	0 0	Electives	0	#### - Means responses to		are not enough mificant	
				? I	0 0	Other	11				

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course Section: ART 334 0101

19

GRAPHIC DESIGN IV

LENZER, JANET

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 19

Fall 2006

Page 100

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

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

		Ouestion		NR	NA		_	ncies 3	§ 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean				
			- 															
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	3	0	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	1131/1669	4.03	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.06
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	3	0	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	881/1666	4.20	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.25
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	3	14	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.25	****
4. Did ot	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	4	0	0	2	2	3	8	4.13	934/1617	4.07	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.13
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	12	0	0	-	0	2	4.33	****/1555	2.00	3.73	4.00	4.03	****
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	4	12	0	0	-	1	2	4.67	****/1543	****	3.85	4.06	4.14	****
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	4	0	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	1012/1647	4.20	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.07
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		4	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	1068/1668	4.55	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.67
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	7	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	918/1605	3.90	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.00
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	the instr	prepared	5	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	1003/1514	4.10	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.36		
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	4	0	0		1		13	4.80	788/1551	4.76	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.80
				xplained clearly	5				2		5	4.07	1030/1503	3.87	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.07
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	4	0	2	0	2	2	9	4.07	1042/1506	3.96	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.07
5. Did av	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	5	6	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	445/1311	4.25	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.25
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	1	8	4.23	709/1490	4.33	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.23
2. Were a	all stude:	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	7	0			1			4.50		4.54	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.50
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	7					2	9	4.58	613/1489	4.36	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.58
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful		8	7	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1006	3.25	4.06	4.00	4.10	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	quir	ea id	or Ma	ajor	S	U	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 4		~		,				0	77 3		0	37		4
56-83		2.00-2.99	2	C 2		Gei	nera	T				0	Under-g	rad I	9	Non-	major	4
84-150	10 0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0 F 0		m 2						0	инии -	Maa +	h			-la
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	9	F 0		EΙ	ecti	ves				0	#### - :				_	311
				- 0		0.3					-	-	respons	es to E	e sign	ıırıcan	I L	
				I 0		Otl	her				1	.5						

? 2

Course Section: ART 334 0201 University of Maryland Page 101
Title GRAPHIC DESIGN IV Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Instructor: LENZER, JANET Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questionnaires: 9

2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate

4. Were special techniques successful

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion

				Fr	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1173/1669	4.03	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.00
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1001/1666	4.20	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.14
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.25	****
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1029/1617	4.07	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.00
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	1545/1555	2.00	3.73	4.00	4.03	2.00
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1543	****	3.85	4.06	4.14	****
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	759/1647	4.20	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.33
8.	How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1257/1668	4.55	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.43
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1172/1605	3.90	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.80
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1295/1514	4.10	4.26	4.39	4.46	3.83
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	954/1551	4.76	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.71
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1277/1503	3.87	4.22	4.24	4.28	3.67
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1199/1506	3.96	4.20	4.26	4.30	3.86
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	535/1490	4.33	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.43

Frequency Distribution

0

0 0 1

0

2

2

0

5 4.57 567/1502 4.54 4.37 4.26 4.28 4.57

3 4.14 986/1489 4.36 4.49 4.29 4.35 4.14

0 1 1 1 3.25 873/1006 3.25 4.06 4.00 4.10 3.25

2 0

2

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

University of Maryland Page 102 Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

26 Questionnaires: 26 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course Section: ART 335 0101

GRAPHIC DESIGN V

KIRSTEL, HARVEY

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

		NR	NA		_		3	5		ructor Rank		_					
	Genera	1															
_	J ,			8	0	1	1	4	6	6		,		4.26	4.23	4.28	3.83
				8		0	1	4	6	7	4.06	,				4.20	4.06
_			_	8		0	-	_	3	4	4.38						4.38
				8		-			3	6							3.88
				9		-			6	5						4.03	3.94
	_		2	9		-	-		2	4						4.14	4.25
			ined	9	-	•		-	3	13		- ,				4.14	4.65
				_	•	•	•	•	1	16						4.68	4.94
uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	9	2	0	0	4	9	2	3.87	1124/1605	3.87	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.87
e the instructor's lectures well prepared					-		-	-	5			- , -					4.71
the instructor seem interested in the subject									3								4.59
									6								4.50
			-														4.35
diovisua:	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	9	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	108/1311	4.82	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.82
				11	0	4	3	2	2	4		,			4.05	4.11	
				10					3	5	3.56	1287/1502	3.56	4.37	4.26	4.28	3.56
			d open discussion	10	•		_	-	4	6				4.49	4.29	4.35	3.75
pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		10	8	2	0	3	0	3	3.25	873/1006	3.25	4.06	4.00	4.10	3.25
			Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	8
1	0.00-0.99	0	 А 11		Red	auir	ed f	or Ma	ior	 s	0	Graduat	 e	1	Maic	 r	9
0		-	В 6		2.0	-1		10	- ,	-	-	CIGGGG	-	_		_	-
1			C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-a	rad 2	:5	Non-	major	17
· -			D 0			a.	_				-	011401 9	2	-	2.021		±.
5.00 5.15 5 5					Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enous	ηh
-	3.33 1.30	-	P 0								-					_	,
			I 0		O+1	her				1	7			9-		-	
			? 0		001					-							
	he instruction of the control of the	General gain new insights, ski e instructor make clear exam questions reflect signed readings contribiten assignments contre grading system clearl ny times was class canculd you grade the overal Lectur he instructor's lecture e instructor seem intercture material presente e lectures contribute t diovisual techniques en Discus ass discussions contribil students actively en e instructor encourage pecial techniques succes arned Cum. GPA	Lecture he instructor system clear the exigence readings contribute to itten assignments contribute to grading system clearly explainly times was class cancelled uld you grade the overall teach the instructor's lectures well existed includes contribute to what diovisual techniques enhance your contribute to assignments contribute to see instructor seem interested include material presented and existed existed includes actively encourage existed instructor encourage fair and pecial techniques successful arned Cum. GPA 1 0.00-0.99 0 0 1.00-1.99 0 1 2.00-2.99 2 4 3.00-3.49 3	General u gain new insights, skills from this course is instructor make clear the expected goals her evaluations reflect the expected goals her evaluations reflect the expected goals signed readings contribute to what you learned itten assignments contribute to what you learned e grading system clearly explained ny times was class cancelled uld you grade the overall teaching effectiveness Lecture he instructor's lectures well prepared e instructor seem interested in the subject cture material presented and explained clearly e lectures contribute to what you learned diovisual techniques enhance your understanding Discussion ass discussions contribute to what you learned all students actively encouraged to participate e instructor encourage fair and open discussion pecial techniques successful Frequence arned Cum. GPA Expected Grades 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 11 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 1 2.00-2.99 2 C 0 4 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 1 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 P 0 I 0	General u gain new insights, skills from this course e instructor make clear the expected goals her evaluations reflect the expected goals signed readings contribute to what you learned itten assignments contribute to what you learned gitten assignments contribute to what you learned guld you grade the overall teaching effectiveness Lecture he instructor's lectures well prepared ge instructor seem interested in the subject cuture material presented and explained clearly ge lectures contribute to what you learned glicular endingues enhance your understanding Discussion ass discussions contribute to what you learned ll students actively encouraged to participate ge instructor encourage fair and open discussion pecial techniques successful Frequency arned Cum. GPA Expected Grades 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 11 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 1 2.00-2.99 2 C 0 4 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 1 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 P 0 I 0	General u gain new insights, skills from this course e instructor make clear the expected goals e exam questions reflect the expected goals her evaluations reflect the expected goals signed readings contribute to what you learned itten assignments contribute to what you learned e grading system clearly explained ony times was class cancelled ony times was class cancelled ony uld you grade the overall teaching effectiveness Lecture he instructor's lectures well prepared e instructor seem interested in the subject cture material presented and explained clearly e lectures contribute to what you learned giovisual techniques enhance your understanding Discussion ass discussions contribute to what you learned ll students actively encouraged to participate e instructor encourage fair and open discussion pecial techniques successful Frequency Dis arned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Frequency Dis arned Cum. GPA Frequency Dis arned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	Questions NR NA 1 NR NA 1 General	Questions	Questions	General u gain new insights, skills from this course	Questions						

Course Section: ART 341 0101 University of Mary: Title INTRO TO ANIMATION Baltimore County Instructor: DELANEY, RICK Fall 2006

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 103

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 14
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did voi	u dain ne	w insights,ski		m this course	4	0	0	0	2	5	3	4 10	1103/1669	4 16	4 26	4.23	4.28	4.10
		tor make clear			4	0	0	1	2	3	4		1094/1666		4.18	4.19	4.20	4.00
		estions reflec			5	8	0	0	0	0	1		****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.25	****
		ations reflect			4	0	0	0	1	2	7		394/1617	4.63	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.60
				what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00			3.73	4.00	4.03	4.00
				what you learned	4	7	1	0	1	0	1		****/1543		3.85	4.06	4.14	****
		system clearl		2	4	0	0	3	2	3	2		1440/1647		3.97		4.14	3.40
		was class canc			4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1668			4.67	4.68	5.00
	-			ning effectiveness	5	1	0	0	2	6	0	3.75	1210/1605					3.75
1 Wassa +1		Lectur	_		4	0	0	0	2	2	1	1 10	1170/1514	2 00	1 00	4 20	1 10	1 10
		ctor's lecture			4	0	0	0	3	3			1172/1514			4.39	4.46	
		tor seem inter			4	0	0	1	3 4	2			1443/1551			4.66	4.70	3.90
				xplained clearly	4	0	1	0	4	2			1168/1503 1300/1506		4.22	4.24	4.28	3.90
		s contribute t		-			0	0	1								4.30	3.60
5. Did aud	alovisuai	tecnniques en	nance y	our understanding	4	0	U	U	Τ	1	8	4.70	174/1311	4.52	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.70
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	372/1490	4.19	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.63
2. Were a	ll studen	ts actively en	courage	d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1502	4.69	4.37	4.26	4.28	5.00
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage	fair and	d open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	827/1489	4.31	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.38
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		6	5	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1006	4.00	4.06	4.00	4.10	****
		Semina	_															
4 54		ns contribute	_]	1 2	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	****/ 105	****	4.75	4 20	4.45	****
		or grading mad		you rearned	13 13	0	0	0	0	1	U T		****/ 98			4.20	4.45	****
J. WEIE CI	ricciia i	or grading mad	c cicai		13	U	O	O	O	_	O	1.00	, 50		1.00	3.73	1.13	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ıtioı	ı									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	1
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 4			 quire					1	Graduat		0	Majo	~~~~~	8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 5		rec	4urre	=u 10	J⊥ 1*1c	וטנג	D	_	Graduati	5	U	Ma JC	,_	O
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	neral	ı				2	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	major	6
84-150	1	3.00-2.99	0	D 0		GEI	ici a.	L				4	onder -g.	Luu 1		INOII	iia jui	U
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	Б 0 F 0		בוק	ectiv	700				0	#### - 1	Meane +	here a	re not	enous	h
Grau.	U	3.30- 1 .00	J	P 1		11.1	-CL1	(CD				U	respons				_	11
				I O		O+1	ner					7	T CPPOILE		c bigi	cai		
				5 0		OLI	101					,						
				. 0														

Course Section: ART 341 0201 University of Maryland Page 104
Title INTRO TO ANIMATION Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Instructor: DELANEY, RICK Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 11

Questionnaires: 11

Student	Course	Eval	luation	Questionnai	re
---------	--------	------	---------	-------------	----

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	.1															
1. Di	id you gai:	n new insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	2	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	951/1669	4.16	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.22
2. Di	id the inst	tructor make clear	the ex	spected goals	2	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1250/1666	3.94	4.18	4.19	4.20	3.89
3. Di	id the exar	m questions reflec	t the e	expected goals	2	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.25	****
4. Di	id other e	valuations reflect	the ex	spected goals	2	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	323/1617	4.63	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.67
5. Di	id assigned	d readings contrik	ute to	what you learned	2	2	3	0	0	1	3	3.14	1401/1555	3.57	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.14
6. Di	id written	assignments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	2	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1543	****	3.85	4.06	4.14	****
7. Wa	as the grad	ding system clearl	y expla	ined	2	0	0	2	3	2	2	3.44	1421/1647	3.42	3.97	4.12	4.14	3.44
8. Ho	ow many tir	mes was class cand	elled		2	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	1400/1668	4.61	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.22
9. Ho	ow would yo	ou grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	1391/1605	3.59	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.43
		Lectur	·e															
1. We	ere the ins	structor's lecture		prepared	2	0	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	1352/1514	3.88	4.26	4.39	4.46	3.67
		ructor seem inter			2	0	1	0	1	3	4		1404/1551	3.95	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.00
		material presente		3	2	0	1	2	1	2	3		1351/1503	3.67	4.22	4.24	4.28	3.44
		tures contribute t			2	0	2	1	1	2	3		1361/1506	3.47	4.20	4.26	4.30	3.33
				our understanding	2	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33			4.26	3.85	3.97	4.33
		Discus	gion															
1 D÷	id class d	iscussions contrib		what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	3	2	3 75	1036/1490	4.19	4.17	4.05	4.11	3.75
		idents actively er		-	3	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	781/1502	4.69	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.38
				nd open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	920/1489	4.31	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.25
		l techniques succe		ia open arbeablion	3	2	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.06	4.00	4.10	4.00
1. "	ere specia.	r ccomingach bacce	.bbrur		3	_	Ü	_	J	3	_	1.00	175/1000	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.10	1.00
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credi	its Earned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-2	 27 0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 4		Red	auir	 ed fo	or Ma	 ajors		0	Graduat	 -	0	Majo	 r	8
28-5		1.00-1.99	0	В 4		2.0	-1 ~ -1 ,			, 0 = 0		-	CIGGGG	-	-		_	J
56-8		2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	major	3
84-1		3.00-3.49	1	B 0			a.	_				-	011401 9		_	2.011		_
Grad		3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enone	ιh
22 40		2.22 2.00	_	P 0								-	respons				_	,
				I 0		O+1	her					8					-	
				± 0		001						-						

Course Section: ART 342 0101 University of Maryland Title FILM/VIDEO THEORY & CR Baltimore County

Instructor: WORDEN, FRED Enrollment: 12

Questionnaires: 12

56-83

Grad.

84-150

2

3

0

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

1

С

D

F

Ρ

I

?

1

0

0

0

0

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 105 JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Non-major

2

							Fr	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions				NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	.1															
1 Did vo	u dain ne	ew insights,ski	-	om this course	Ω	0	0	0	Ω	4	Q	4.67	389/1669	4.67	4 26	4.23	4.28	4.67
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	4	7		549/1666	4.50	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.50
		estions reflec		_	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	557/1421	4.50	4.47	4.24	4.25	4.50
	_	ations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	414/1617	4.58	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.58
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	100/1555	4.91	3.73	4.00	4.03	4.91
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	552/1543	4.36	3.85	4.06	4.14	4.36
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	566/1647	4.45	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.45
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	278/1605	4.63	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.63
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	489/1514	4.73	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.73
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested :	in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	512/1551	4.91	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.91
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	d and	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	425/1503	4.64	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.64
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	353/1506	4.75	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.75
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	228/1311	4.58	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.58
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	340/1490	4.67	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.67
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	393/1502	4.75	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.75
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	532/1489	4.67	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.67
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	essful		1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	271/1006	4.45	4.06	4.00	4.10	4.45
								ution	n									
															_			
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	asons	5 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	
00-27	27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4					Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6									_		_			

General

Other

Electives

0

0

10

Under-grad 12

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course Section: ART 345 0101 University of Maryland FILM II:SOUND & IMAGE Baltimore County

Title Instructor: COOK, CATHY Fall 2006

Enro	1	lment	:	6	
_				_	

Questionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 106

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque:	ncies	;		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 I															
1. Did vo	nı gain ne	ew insights,skil	_	this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	269/1669	4.75	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.75
		tor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	243/1666	4.75	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.75
		estions reflect	_	_	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.47	4.24	4.25	5.00
	_	ations reflect			1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	219/1617	4.75	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.75
			_	hat you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.73	4.00	4.03	4.00
	_	_		what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	580/1543	4.33	3.85	4.06	4.14	4.33
		system clearly		-	2	0	0	0	1	1	1		1043/1647	4.00	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.00
		was class cance	-		3	0	0	0	0	1	1		1190/1668	4.50	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.50
	-			ing effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.13	4.07	4.09	5.00
		•		3														
		Lecture	9															
1. Were t	e the instructor's lectures well prepared			repared	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	441/1514	4.75	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.75
2. Did th	the instructor seem interested in the subject			the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1028/1551	4.67	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.67
3. Was le	s lecture material presented and explained clear			plained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	386/1503	4.67	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.67
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute to	what y	ou learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	838/1506	4.33	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.33
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enl	nance yo	ur understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	189/1311	4.67	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.67
		Discus																
				hat you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	622/1490		4.17	4.05	4.11	4.33
				to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	486/1502	4.67	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.67
				open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	532/1489	4.67	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.67
4. Were s	special te	chniques succes	ssful		2	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.06	4.00	4.10	4.00
				Frequ	ıency	7 Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	auire	ad f	or Ma	iors		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2		1000	quil	- L	JI 110			· ·	Gradade	_	· ·	11000	-	3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0				_				-	011001 9		-	2.021		-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoue	rh
	-		-	P 0									respons				_	•
				I 0		Otl	her					3	-		3			
				? 0														

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course Section: ART 346 0101

8

VIDEO II

GRABILL, VIN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 107

C+udon+	Courac	Erraluation	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnarie

					Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4						Inst	ructor Course Dept			UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.50
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	412/1666	4.63	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.63
		uestions reflec			0	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.47	4.24	4.25	4.67
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.50
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	5	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1133/1555	3.67	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.67
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	895/1543	4.00	3.85	4.06	4.14	4.00
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	481/1647	4.50	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.50
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.68	5.00
				hing effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	373/1605	4.50	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.50
		Lectur	۵															
1. Were ti	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	505/1514	4.71	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.71
					1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	954/1551	4.71	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.71
	d the instructor seem interested in the subject s lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	1	6	4.86	173/1503	4.86	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.86
		es contribute t		1	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	575/1506	4.57	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.57
				our understanding	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	189/1311	4.67	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.67
		Discus	aion															
1 Did al-	agg digg			what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	162/1490	4.88	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.88
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.37	4.26	4.28	5.00
		_	_	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.35	5.00
		echniques succe		a open arscassion	0	3	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	407/1006	4.20	4.06	4.00	4.10	4.20
				_		<u> </u>	,											
				Frequ	.ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	 guir	ed f	or Ma	ijors		0	Graduate	 e	0	Majo		8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1						J						5 -		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-gr	rad	8	Non-	major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									5				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									response					
				I 0		Otl	her					7	_		_			

Course Section: ART 350 0101

Title CONSTRUCTED ENVIRONMEN

Instructor: DURANT, MARK

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 108 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	207/1669	4.80	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	319/1666	4.70	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	8	0	0	0	0	2		****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	114/1617	4.90	4.30	4.15		4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	644/1555	4.17	3.73	4.00	4.03	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	2	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	901/1668	4.80	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.13	4.07	4.09	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.26	4.39	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.22	4.24	4.28	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.20	4.26	4.30	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	90/1311	4.88	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	192/1490	4.83	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.37	4.26	4.28	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.35	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1006	****	4.06	4.00	4.10	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.08	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	2.50	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	1.67	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.03	****
Frage	onat	. Dia	+ v i h	u+ i o	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9 9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	Under-grad 13		4
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course Section: ART 351 0101 BLACK & WHITE PHOTO SILBERG, STEVEN Fall 2006

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 12

Page 109 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course	${\tt Evaluation}$	Questionnaire
----------------	--------------------	---------------

	Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	881/1666	4.25	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	1100/1421	3.83	4.47	4.24	4.25	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	323/1617	4.67	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	3	2	3.17	1395/1555	3.17	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	4	3	1	2.92	1456/1543	2.92	3.85	4.06	4.14	2.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	481/1647	4.50	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1265/1668	4.42	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	8	1	3.91	1092/1605	3.91	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	1022/1514	4.33	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	1338/1551	4.25	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	800/1503	4.33	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	909/1506	4.25	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	6	3	3.91	699/1311	3.91	4.26	3.85	3.97	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	749/1490	4.18	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	866/1502		4.37	4.26	4.28	4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	0	1	1	7	4.00	1038/1489	4.00	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.06	4.00	4.10	4.00
-														

Credits Ea	Earned Cum. GPA Exp				Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	2	Under-grad	12	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there a	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-			
				2	0						

Course Section: ART 353 0101 University of Maryland Title COLOR PHOTOGRAPHY Baltimore County Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN Fall 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

9

University of Maryland Page 110
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

	Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	269/1669	4.75	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	243/1666	4.75	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.30	4.15	4.22	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1555	5.00	3.73	4.00	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	210/1543	4.71	3.85	4.06	4.14	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1647	5.00	3.97	4.12	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1106/1668	4.63	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	373/1605	4.50	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1514	4.88	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	594/1551	4.88	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	277/1503	4.75	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	200/1506	4.88	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	90/1311	4.88	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	445/1490	4.50	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	486/1502	4.67	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	532/1489	4.67	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	4.06	4.00	4.10	****
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 8		Required for Majors					 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo		8

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

Course Section: ART 356 0101 University of Maryland Title ALTERNATIVE PROCESSES Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: PEREGOY, CHRIST

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 11

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

Ρ

I

?

0

0

1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 111

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

					- 1			Inst	ructor	uctor Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect				
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 .1															
1. Did voi	u gain n	ew insights,ski	.lls fro	om this course	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	167/1669	4.86	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.86
		ctor make clear			4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	142/1666	4.86	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.86
		uestions reflec		_	4	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.47	4.24	4.25	5.00
4. Did oth	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	4	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	161/1617	4.80	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.80
5. Did ass	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1555	5.00	3.73	4.00	4.03	5.00
6. Did wr:	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	4	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1543	5.00	3.85	4.06	4.14	5.00
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	4	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	828/1647	4.29	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.29
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	844/1668	4.83	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.83
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	239/1605	4.67	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.67
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	_	prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	505/1514	4.71	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.71
		ctor seem inter			4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	650/1551	4.86	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.86
				explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	173/1503	4.86	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.86
		es contribute t			4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	225/1506	4.86	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.86
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	97/1311	4.86	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.86
		Discus	gion															
1 Did cla	agg digg			what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	389/1490	4.60	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.60
				ed to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	336/1502	4.80	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.80
		_	_	nd open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	378/1489	4.80	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.80
		echniques succe			6	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	307/1006	4.40	4.06	4.00	4.10	4.40
				Frequ	anas	, Diet	-ri h	ut i ou	2									
				rrequ	terrey	DIS		ucioi	1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	}
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red		ed fo	or Ma	aiors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0								-		-	-			•
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	1	Non-	major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									3				-	

Electives

Other

Course Section: ART 359 0101

Title TOPICS IN PHOTOGRAPHY

THOMPSON, CALLA

Instructor:

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 15 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 112 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eaner	ncies			Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	293/1666	4.71	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.47		4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	137/1617	4.86	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	6	6	4.14	665/1555	4.14	3.73	4.00	4.03	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	2	8	4.21	700/1543	4.21	3.85	4.06	4.14	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	1	9	4.36	728/1647	4.36	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	6		1257/1668	4.43	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	298/1605	4.60	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	489/1514	4.73	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	512/1551	4.91	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	0		4.82		4.82	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	509/1506	4.64	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	158/1311	4.73	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.73
1,, 1,, 1,														
Discussion	_				_		_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	316/1490	4.70	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	336/1502	4.80	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	378/1489	4.80	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.06	4.00	4.10	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.63	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	4.75	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.15	****
71.11.71														
Field Work	1.4	0	0	^	0	^	1	F 00	**** / FO	****	0 50	4 00	4 00	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	2.50	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	1.67	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1					4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	4.13	****

Course Section: ART 359 0101

Title TOPICS IN PHOTOGRAPHY

Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 112 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	15	Non-major	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course Section: ART 360 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 MIXED MEDIA BOOK ARTS

Instructor: CHAN, IRENE

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 11

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 113

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Outstians						- 3			Inst	ructor Course Dept		e Dept	UMBC Level		Sect			
	Questions						1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 L															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	ew insights,skil	lls fro	om this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.28	5.00
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	549/1666	4.50	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.50
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflect	the e	expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.47	4.24	4.25	4.67
4. Did oth	ner evalı	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	750/1617	4.30	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.30
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	0	4	3.30	1336/1555	3.30	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.30
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contri	ibute t	to what you learned	1	1	3	1	1	2	2	2.89	1466/1543	2.89	3.85	4.06	4.14	2.89
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	expla	ained	1	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	926/1647	4.20	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.20
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	1353/1668	4.30	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.30
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overal	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	840/1605	4.11	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.11
	Lecture																	
1 Ware th	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	1	1	8	4.70	537/1514	4.70	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.70
	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.70	5.00
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	220/1503	4.80	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.80
		es contribute to			1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	433/1506		4.20	4.26	4.30	4.70
				your understanding	1	6	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	264/1311		4.26	3.85	3.97	4.50
J. Dia ado	21011040	r cccimiiqueb cin	idiice j	our underbeanding	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	5	1.50	201/1311	1.50	1.20	3.03	3.57	1.50
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contribu	ite to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	340/1490	4.67	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.67
		_	_	ed to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1502		4.37	4.26	4.28	5.00
		_		nd open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	299/1489		4.49	4.29	4.35	4.89
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		2	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1006	4.75	4.06	4.00	4.10	4.75
	Fr							ution	ı									
a 11. =								_										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade						Reasons Type Ma						Majors	; 					
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5						Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	7
28-55																		
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 1 C 0						Ger	nera:	1				2	Under-grad 11 Non-major 4			4		
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0																		
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						Electives 1 #### - Means there are not							enoug	jh				

Other

5

Ρ

I

?

0

0

Course Section: ART 382 0101 University of Maryland Page 114
Title INTERACTIVITY Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Instructor: REINSEL, JOSEPH Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 13

Questionnaires:	13	Student (Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Frequencies						Instructor		Course	. Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions		NR	NA	1	-		4	5		Rank		Mean			Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills i	rom this course	6	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	876/1669	4.29	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the	expected goals	6	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1353/1666	3.71	4.18	4.19	4.20	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the	e expected goals	6	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the	expected goals	6	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1617	****	4.30	4.15	4.22	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute t	o what you learned	6	2	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1021/1555	3.80	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly exp	plained	6	1	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1321/1647	3.67	3.97	4.12	4.14	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	l	6	0	0	0	2	5	0	3.71	1620/1668	3.71	4.62	4.67	4.68	3.71
9. How would you grade the overall to	eaching effectiveness	7	0	2	0	2	2	0	2.67	1549/1605	2.67	4.13	4.07	4.09	2.67
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well	l prepared	6	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	1337/1514	3.71	4.26	4.39	4.46	3.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested		6	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	1326/1551	4.29	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and	_	6	0	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	1309/1503	3.57	4.22	4.24	4.28	3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what	_	6	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1258/1506	3.71	4.20	4.26	4.30	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance		6	0	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	731/1311	3.86	4.26	3.85	3.97	3.86
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute t	o what vou learned	6	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1202/1490	3.43	4.17	4.05	4.11	3.43
2. Were all students actively encoura		6	0	0	1	1				1013/1502		4.37	4.26	4.28	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair		6	0	0	1	1	1			986/1489		4.49	4.29		4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	_	6	4	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1006	****	4.06	4.00	4.10	****
	ıency	Dis	trib	utio:	n										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0		Required for Majors 2 Graduate 0 Ma					Majo	 or	4						

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

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Course Section: ART 384 0101 University of Maryland Page 115 COMPUTER ANIMATION JAN 18, 2007 MCINTYRE, FRANK Job IRBR3029

Instructor:

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	16

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Overtions					Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	-	m this course	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1669	4.79	4.26	4.23	4.28	5.00
		ctor make clear			2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	206/1666	4.61	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.79
		uestions reflec			2	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.25	***
	_	uations reflect		_	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	347/1617	4.75	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.64
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	988/1555	3.51	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.85
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	2	2	0	2	1	5	4	3.92	1006/1543	4.13	3.85	4.06	4.14	3.92
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	3	0	0	3	2	4	4	3.69	1305/1647	4.01	3.97	4.12	4.14	3.69
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	99/1605	4.70	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.91
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	151/1514	4.86	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.92	
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.70	5.00
				xplained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	277/1503	4.38	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.75
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	131/1506	4.71	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.92
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	63/1311	4.71	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.92
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	242/1490	4.76	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.78
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	256/1502	4.94	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.89
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	532/1489	4.71	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.67
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	essful		7	4	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.06	4.00	4.10	5.00
	F						trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	Expected Grades						Ту	pe			Majors	:						
00-27						Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	12
28-55																		
56-83					Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	4	
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 5 D 0					_						_			_				
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0					Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh	
P 0											_	respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt		
	I 0						her				1	.3						

Baltimore County

Fall 2006

Course Section: ART 384 0201 University of Maryland Page 116 Title COMPUTER ANIMATION JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: MCINTYRE, FRANK

I

?

0

0

Enrollment:

11

Freque					ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
	Questions					NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	-	m this course	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	511/1669	4.79	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.57
_	-	ctor make clear			4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	662/1666		4.18	4.19	4.20	4.43
		uestions reflec		-	4	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.25	***
	_	uations reflect		_	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	137/1617	4.75	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.86
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	1	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1395/1555	3.51	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.17
	-	-		o what you learned	4	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	580/1543	4.13	3.85	4.06	4.14	4.33
		g system clearl		_	4	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	759/1647	4.01	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.33
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.68	5.00
				hing effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	373/1605	4.70	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.50
		Lectur																
1 Were t	he instr	prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	360/1514	4.86	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.80		
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.70	5.00
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearl						0	0	1	2	1		1066/1503		4.22	4.24	4.28	4.00
		es contribute t			7	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	642/1506		4.20	4.26	4.30	4.50
				our understanding	7	-	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	264/1311		4.26	3.85	3.97	
J. Dia au	aiovibaa.	r cccinirques en	mance j	our understanding	,	O	O	Ü	_	O	J	1.50	201/1311	1.71	1.20	3.03	3.57	1.50
		Discus																
				what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1490		4.17	4.05	4.11	4.75
		_	_	d to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1502	4.94	4.37	4.26	4.28	5.00
		_		d open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	434/1489	4.71	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.75
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		7	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1006	5.00	4.06	4.00	4.10	****
				Frequ	iency	, Dist	trib	ution	n									
								Frequency Distribution										
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	asons	3 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	;
00-27						Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	;	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3														
56-83						Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	-major	5
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0																		
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0						Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	_J h
	P 0				responses to be significant					ıt								

Other

7

Course Section: ART 388 0101 University of Maryland ART ON THE INTERNET Baltimore County Instructor: HOWELL, BRENDAN

Title

Page 117 JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	14				
Questionnaires:	13	Student Co	ourse	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. D	id vou gain	new insights, ski	_	m this course	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.28	5.00
		ructor make clear			7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1666	4.83	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.83
		questions reflec			7	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.25	***
		aluations reflect		_	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.30	4.15	4.22	5.00
5. D	id assigned	readings contrib	ute to	what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	996/1555	3.83	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.83
6. D	id written	assignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	7	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	298/1543	4.60	3.85	4.06	4.14	4.60
		ing system clearl		_	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1647	5.00	3.97	4.12	4.14	5.00
8. H	ow many tim	es was class canc	elled		7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1068/1668	4.67	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.67
9. H	ow would yo	u grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	499/1605	4.40	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.40
		Lectur																
		tructor's lecture			9	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1514			4.39	4.46	5.00
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.70	5.00
	 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 					0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1503	5.00	4.22	4.24	4.28	5.00
				-	9	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1506			4.26	4.30	5.00
5. D	id audiovis	ual techniques en	hance y	our understanding	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1311	5.00	4.26	3.85	3.97	5.00
		- ·																
1 5		Discus				0	0	•	0	•	0	F 00	***** / 1 4 0 0	de de de de	4 15	4 05	4 11	***
		scussions contrib			11	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1490			4.05	4.11	
		dents actively en			8	0	0	3	0	0	2		1376/1502		4.37	4.26	4.28	3.20
		ructor encourage		d open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1489	****	4.49	4.29	4.35	****
4. W	ere special	techniques succe	ssiul		11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1006	****	4.06	4.00	4.10	****
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	tribı	ıt i or	า									
				11040	aciic j	DID	C1 1D(20101	-									
Cred	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	asons	5			Ty	рe			Majors	\$
00-	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2					Red	guire	ed fo	or Ma	. jors		2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r •	1
28-	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2						_			,						3		
56-	83 0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Gei	nera:	L				1	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	12
84-	150 2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	General							3				,		
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0					Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	_j h
	P 0												respons				_	
	I 0				Ot1	her					0	-						
	? 0																	
	? 0																	

Course Section: ART 389 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007

Title TOPICS IN COMPUTER ART

Instructor: STROUD, DAVID

Enrollment: 14 Ouestionnaires: 12

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Page 118

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 2 4 1 3.00 1596/1669 3.00 4.26 4.23 4.28 3.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 3 1 6 0 2 2.75 1615/1666 2.75 4.18 4.19 4.20 2.75 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 10 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/1421 **** 4.47 4.24 4.25 **** 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 1 1 4 4 1 3.27 1467/1617 3.27 4.30 4.15 4.22 3.27 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 10 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/1555 **** 3.73 4.00 4.03 **** 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 9 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 895/1543 4.00 3.85 4.06 4.14 4.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 5 3 2 0 0 2 2.43 1595/1647 2.43 3.97 4.12 4.14 2.43 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 5 6 4.55 1164/1668 4.55 4.62 4.67 4.68 4.55 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 3 1 2 4 0 2.70 1545/1605 2.70 4.13 4.07 4.09 2.70 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 1 2 3 2 3.75 1324/1514 3.75 4.26 4.39 4.46 3.75 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 1 1 2 4 4.13 1384/1551 4.13 4.74 4.66 4.70 4.13 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 2 2 1 3 3.63 1293/1503 3.63 4.22 4.24 4.28 3.63 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 1 1 3 2 1 3.13 1395/1506 3.13 4.20 4.26 4.30 3.13 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0 0 1 1 4 2 3.88 718/1311 3.88 4.26 3.85 3.97 3.88 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 3 1 1 3.60 1117/1490 3.60 4.17 4.05 4.11 3.60 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 540/1502 4.60 4.37 4.26 4.28 4.60 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.40 800/1489 4.40 4.49 4.29 4.35 4.40

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Ĺ
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	8						

Course Section: ART 389B 0101 University of Maryland Title TOPICS IN COMPUTER ART Baltimore County

Instructor: BRADLEY, STEPHE 8

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 8

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 119

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 4 4 4.50 590/1669 4.50 4.26 4.23 4.28 4.50 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 1 3 3 4.29 841/1666 4.29 4.18 4.19 4.20 4.29 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 7 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1421 **** 4.47 4.24 4.25 **** 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 3 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 394/1617 4.60 4.30 4.15 4.22 4.60 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 3 0 0 3 2 0 3.40 1303/1555 3.40 3.73 4.00 4.03 3.40 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1543 **** 3.85 4.06 4.14 **** 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 5 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 1043/1647 4.00 3.97 4.12 4.14 4.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 769/1668 4.88 4.62 4.67 4.68 4.88 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness $1 \quad 0 \quad 0$ 0 0 1 6 4.86 119/1605 4.86 4.13 4.07 4.09 4.86 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 Ω Ω 0 0 5 5.00 1/1514 5.00 4.26 4.39 4.46 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1551 5.00 4.74 4.66 4.70 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1503 5.00 4.22 4.24 4.28 5.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 547/1506 4.60 4.20 4.26 4.30 4.60 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1311 5.00 4.26 3.85 3.97 5.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1490 5.00 4.17 4.05 4.11 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1502 5.00 4.37 4.26 4.28 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.49 4.29 4.35 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 3 1 0 0 0 4 5.00 0 1/1006 5.00 4.06 4.00 4.10 5.00

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

Course Section: ART 392 0101 University of Maryland Title TOPICS IN ART OR MEDIA

Baltimore County

Page 120

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Fall 2006 Instructor: SALTZMAN, RICK Enrollment: 16

0

0

0

Ρ I

		_			
Questionnaires:	16	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

					Frequencies				Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5		Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did v	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil	=	m this course	8	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1077/1669	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.13
		ctor make clear			8	0	0	0	2	4	2		1094/1666		4.18	4.19	4.20	4.00
		uestions reflect			8	6	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.25	****
4. Did c	ther evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	8	1	0	2	3	1	1	3.14	1494/1617	3.34	4.30	4.15	4.22	3.14
5. Did a	assigned re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	8	2	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	773/1555	3.40	3.73	4.00	4.03	4.00
6. Did w	vritten ass	signments contri	bute to	o what you learned	8	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1543	1.50	3.85	4.06	4.14	****
7. Was t	he grading	g system clearly	expla	ined	8	1	2	2	2	1	0	2.29	1603/1647	2.68	3.97	4.12	4.14	2.29
8. How m	many times	was class cance	elled		8	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	769/1668		4.62	4.67	4.68	4.88
9. How w	vould you	grade the overal	.l teac	hing effectiveness	9	0	1	2	1	2	1	3.00	1501/1605	3.27	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.00
		Lecture	_															
		uctor's lectures			8	0	0	2	0	4	2		1324/1514		4.26	4.39	4.46	3.75
		ctor seem intere		-	9 9	0	0	0	1	2	4		1254/1551		4.74	4.66	4.70	4.43
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearl						0	1	3	2	1		1358/1503		4.22	4.24	4.28	3.43
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						1	2	1	0	3	3.29	1371/1506		4.20	4.26	4.30	3.29
5. Did a	audiovisual	l techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	9	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1048/1311	3.46	4.26	3.85	3.97	3.29
		Discuss					_		_		_							
				what you learned	11	0	2	Ι	Τ	0	Τ		1447/1490		4.17	4.05	4.11	2.40
		_	_	d to participate	11	0	2	1	1	0	Τ		1484/1502		4.37	4.26	4.28	2.40
		_		d open discussion	11	0	2	1	1	0	1		1472/1489		4.49	4.29	4.35	2.40
4. Were	special te	echniques succes	ssiul		11	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	4.06	4.00	4.10	****
		Field V	7															
3 Did 1	ron aloomia	rieid v y understand you		uation gritoria	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 52	****	1.67	1 06	3.59	****
Z. Dia y	ou clearly	y understand you	ıı evai	uation criteria	13	U		U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 52		1.07	4.00	3.39	
Fr						Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade								Rea	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27						Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	.99 1 B 3															
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	l				5	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	major	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives						0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h	

Other

3

Course Section: ART 392 0201 University of Maryland Page 121 Title TOPICS IN ART OR MEDIA Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SALTZMAN, RICK

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	852/1669	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	1	7	3.77	1329/1666	3.88	4.18	4.19	4.20	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	0	1	7	3.54	1360/1617	3.34	4.30	4.15	4.22	3.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	0	4	2	1	2.80	1482/1555	3.40	3.73	4.00	4.03	2.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	3	0	1	0	0	1.50	1541/1543	1.50	3.85	4.06	4.14	1.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	6	1	2	3.08	1522/1647	2.68	3.97	4.12	4.14	3.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1289/1668	4.63	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	1	1	3	4	3.55	1339/1605	3.27	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1381/1514	3.65	4.26	4.39	4.46	3.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	512/1551	4.67	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	1	1	2	4	3.50	1330/1503	3.46	4.22	4.24	4.28	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	0	3	5	3.73	1254/1506	3.51	4.20	4.26	4.30	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	868/1311	3.46	4.26	3.85	3.97	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	4	2	1	3.25	1265/1490	2.83	4.17	4.05	4.11	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1301/1502	2.95	4.37	4.26	4.28	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	1232/1489	3.01	4.49	4.29	4.35	3.63
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utio	n									

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

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course Section: ART 423 0101 University of Maryland Page 122 JAN 18, 2007 Title ART SINCE 1945 Instructor: JACOB, PREMINDA Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

23

			Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	633/1669	4.47	4.26	4.23	4.39	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	3	9		1028/1666	4.12	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	594/1421	4.47	4.47	4.24	4.38	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	5	3	7		1054/1555	3.76	3.73	4.00	4.08	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	857/1543	4.06	3.85	4.06	4.18	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	532/1647	4.47	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	423/1605	4.47	4.13	4.07	4.16	4.47
Lecture	_	_	_		_									
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	0	4	11		1003/1514	4.35	4.26	4.39	4.45	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	307/1551	4.94	4.74	4.66	4.73	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	2	5	8		1040/1503	4.06	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	0	3	10		1047/1506	4.06	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	0	15	4.76	137/1311	4.76	4.26	3.85	3.88	4.76
Discussion	_					_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	324/1490	4.69	4.17	4.05	4.26	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	576/1502	4.56	4.37	4.26	4.46	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	309/1489	4.88	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	2	1	5	6	4.07	465/1006	4.07	4.06	4.00	4.21	4.07
Seminar	1.0	0	0	0	0	_	1	F 00	+ + + + / 110	****	1 (2	4 20	4 74	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 112	****	4.63	4.38	4.74	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	Τ		****/ 97		4.88	4.36	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 92		5.00	4.22	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	4.75	4.20	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.86	****
Field Work														
	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	2 50	4 22	2 04	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	•	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	2.50	4.22	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		, -		1.67	4.06	3.80	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	U	0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	4	Under-grad	17	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-		_	
				2	0						

Course Section: ART 425 0101 University of Maryland Page 123 Title WRIT BY & ABOUT ARTIST Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006

Instructor: MAHONEY, JAMES

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 9

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

Job IRBR3029

						Frequencies In		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	.1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	876/1669	4.29	4.26	4.23	4.39	4.29
		ctor make clear			2	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.00
		uestions reflec			2	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.38	****
		uations reflect			2	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	922/1617	4.14	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.14
				what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	195/1555	4.71	3.73	4.00	4.08	4.71
				o what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	210/1543	4.71	3.85	4.06	4.18	4.71
		g system clearl			2	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1647	****	3.97	4.12	4.14	***
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1257/1668	4.43	4.62	4.67	4.70	4.43
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	.ll tead	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	119/1605	4.86	4.13	4.07	4.16	4.86
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	505/1514	4.71	4.26	4.39	4.45	4.71
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.73	5.00
3. Was le	explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	323/1503	4.71	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.71			
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.20	4.26	4.29	5.00
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	4	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1311	5.00	4.26	3.85	3.88	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.17	4.05	4.26	5.00
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.37	4.26	4.46	5.00
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.52	5.00
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		5	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	4.06	4.00	4.21	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	:
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Maj			ajor	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	4		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	-major	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	

Other

6

0

I ? Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 124

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Fall 2006

Course Section: ART 430 0101 University of Maryland Title GRAPHIC DESIGN VI Instructor: ABRAHAM, GUENET

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 20

28

	Freq								ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	0	4	14	4.45	676/1669	4.45	4.26	4.23	4.39	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	16	4.65	372/1666	4.65	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	16	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	253/1617	4.72	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	3	3	1	0	4	2.91	1470/1555	2.91	3.73	4.00	4.08	2.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	628/1543	4.29	3.85	4.06	4.18	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	1	2	5	9	4.11	984/1647	4.11	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	1157/1668	4.55	4.62	4.67	4.70	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	220/1605	4.69	4.13	4.07	4.16	4.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	1064/1514	4.29	4.26	4.39	4.45	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	788/1551	4.80	4.74	4.66	4.73	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	2	0	11	4.43	686/1503	4.43	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	0	11	4.43	744/1506	4.43	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	8	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	426/1311	4.29	4.26	3.85	3.88	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	340/1490	4.67	4.17	4.05	4.26	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	276/1502		4.37	4.26	4.46	4.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	456/1489	4.73	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	0	2	0	1	5	4.13	447/1006	4.13	4.06	4.00	4.21	4.13

Credits E	edits Earned Cum. GPA			Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	17	Required for Majors	0	 Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	18	=			
				2	0						

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 125

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Course Section: ART 431 0101 University of Maryland Title GRAPHIC DESIGN VII COATES, JOSEPH 23 Instructor:

Enrollment:	23				
Questionnaires:	12	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fr	eque:	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	889/1669	4.27	4.26	4.23	4.39	4.2
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.0
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.47	4.24	4.38	4.6
. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.5
. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1543	****	3.85	4.06	4.18	***
. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	4	2	1	2	3.11	1519/1647	3.11	3.97	4.12	4.14	3.1
. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	1370/1668	4.27	4.62	4.67	4.70	4.2
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1195/1605	3.78	4.13	4.07	4.16	3.7
Lecture														
. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	1082/1514	4.25	4.26	4.39	4.45	4.2
. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1083/1551	4.63	4.74	4.66	4.73	4.
. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.
. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1010/1506	4.13	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.
. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	712/1311	3.89	4.26	3.85	3.88	3.
Discussion														
. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	718/1490	4.22	4.17	4.05	4.26	4.3
. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	586/1502	4.56	4.37	4.26	4.46	4.
. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	753/1489	4.44	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.
l. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.06	4.00	4.21	4.0
Freq	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades			Reasons						Ty	rpe		Majors		
 00_27								·	Craduat		0	Made		11

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course Section: ART 435A 0101 University of Maryland Page 126 REPRESENTATION Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029 STURGEON, JOHN 7

C+udon+	Courac	Erraluation	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnarie

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

							Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	-	om this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	389/1669	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.39	4.67
		ctor make clear			2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	691/1666	4.40	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.40
		uestions reflec			2	4	0	0	0	0	1		****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.38	****
	_	uations reflect		_	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.30	4.15	4.22	5.00
				what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1555	5.00	3.73	4.00	4.08	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	516/1543	4.40	3.85	4.06	4.18	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained						0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1250/1647	3.80	3.97	4.12	4.14	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled						0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1274/1668	4.40	4.62	4.67	4.70	4.40
9. How wo	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness						0	0	0	3	1	4.25	690/1605	4.25	4.13	4.07	4.16	4.25
1. Were t	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.26	4.39	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.73	5.00
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.22	4.24	4.27	5.00
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.20	4.26	4.29	5.00
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1311	5.00	4.26	3.85	3.88	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	214/1490	4.80	4.17	4.05	4.26	4.80
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	540/1502	4.60	4.37	4.26	4.46	4.60
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	378/1489	4.80	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.80
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		2	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	4.06	4.00	4.21	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quir	ea i	or Ma	ajors		0	Graduate	9	0	Majo	or	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3 C 0	a 1						1	TT		7	Mari		4	
56-83 84-150	1	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	0 1	C 0	General						1	Under-g	rau	7	Non-	-major	4	
84-150 Grad.	0	3.50-3.49	1	D 0 F 0	Electives						0	#### - 1	Moona +	homo -	n-+		-h	
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	Τ	P 0	Electives							U	response				_	311
				I 0	Othor						3	response	a LU L	c sign	ııııcal.	10		
				Τ 0		Other												

Course Section: ART 447 0101 University of Maryland Page 127 Title 2D ANIMATION/COMPOSITI Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007

Instructor: DELANEY, RICK

Enrollment:

13 Questionnaires: 13

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	0	0	-1	_	_	1 20	701 /1660	4 40	1 00	4 00	4 20	1 26
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	∠ 1	0	0	0	Τ.	5	5	4.36	781/1669	4.49	4.26	4.23	4.39	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	881/1666	4.31	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	466/1421	4.60	4.47	4.24	4.38	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	_ 2	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	780/1617	4.49	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned		6	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	438/1555	4.03	3.73	4.00	4.08	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learn		8	0	0	0	0	2		****/1543	5.00	3.85	4.06	4.18	****
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	2	0	0	1	5	1	4		1290/1647	3.86	3.97	4.12	4.14	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	7		1096/1668	4.38	4.62	4.67	4.70	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivened	ess 4	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1195/1605	3.82	4.13	4.07	4.16	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	584/1514	4.48	4.26	4.39	4.45	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1028/1551	4.83	4.74	4.66	4.73	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly		0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	510/1503	4.56	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	326/1506	4.46	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	86/1311	4.87	4.26	3.85	3.88	4.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	d 8	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	558/1490	4.37	4.17	4.05	4.26	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	e 8	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	754/1502	4.37	4.37	4.26	4.46	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	on 8	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	596/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1006	****	4.06	4.00	4.21	****
F	requency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad	des			Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	

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

Course Section: ART 447 0201 University of Maryland Title 2D ANIMATION/COMPOSITI Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: MALDONADO, JORG

Enrollment: 11

Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 128

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

							Frequencies					Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question				NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera																
1. Did y	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	448/1669	4.49	4.26	4.23	4.39	4.63
2. Did t	he instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	727/1666	4.31	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.38
3. Did t	he exam q	uestions reflec	ct the	expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	4.60	4.47	4.24	4.38	****
4. Did o	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	265/1617	4.49	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.71
5. Did a	ssigned re	eadings contrik	oute to	what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1133/1555	4.03	3.73	4.00	4.08	3.67
6. Did w	ritten as:	signments contr	ribute	to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1543	5.00	3.85	4.06	4.18	5.00
7. Was t	he grading	g system clearl	ly expla	ained	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1043/1647	3.86	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.00
8. How m	any times	was class cand	celled		0	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	1464/1668	4.38	4.62	4.67	4.70	4.13
9. How w	ould you	grade the overa	all tea	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	0	3.86	1132/1605	3.82	4.13	4.07	4.16	3.86
		Lectur	re															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	1064/1514	4.48	4.26	4.39	4.45	4.29
2. Did t	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	4.83	4.74	4.66	4.73	5.00
3. Was 1	ecture ma	terial presente	ed and	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	491/1503	4.56	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.57
4. Did t	he lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	995/1506	4.46	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.14
5. Did a	udiovisua	l techniques er	nhance	your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	97/1311	4.87	4.26	3.85	3.88	4.86
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	622/1490	4.37	4.17	4.05	4.26	4.33
2. Were	all stude	nts actively en	ncourage	ed to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	818/1502	4.37	4.37	4.26	4.46	4.33
3. Did t	he instru	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	532/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.67
4. Were	special to	echniques succe	essful		5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	4.06	4.00	4.21	****
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credita	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							P.e	ason	e e			Ту	ne			Majors	•
creates Earnea Cum. GPA Expected Grades									_ 								, 	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors				0	Graduat	е	0	Major		8			
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	2	2 00-2 99	Ω	C 1		General						Ω	IInder-a	rad	8	Non-	-maior	Ω

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

Course Section: ART 456 0101

PHOTO SENIOR THESIS I

Title Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 10 Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 129 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

University of Maryland

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	914/1669	4.25	4.26	4.23	4.39	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	0	3	3		1001/1666	4.14	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	0	0	0	1		****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	801/1617	4.25	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1287/1555	3.43	3.73	4.00	4.08	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	5	1	1	3.13	1386/1543	3.13	3.85	4.06	4.18	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	697/1647	4.38	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	769/1668	4.88	4.62	4.67	4.70	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1274/1605	3.67	4.13	4.07	4.16	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	1160/1514	4.13	4.26	4.39	4.45	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1135/1551	4.57	4.74	4.66	4.73	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	323/1503	4.71	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1353/1506	3.38	4.20	4.26	4.29	3.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	731/1311	3.86	4.26	3.85	3.88	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	535/1490	4.43	4.17	4.05	4.26	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	438/1502	4.71	4.37	4.26	4.46	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	329/1489	4.86	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	810/1006	3.40	4.06	4.00	4.21	3.40
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	2.50	4.22	3.94	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ution	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	 6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	4
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	Į
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-			
				2	1						

Course Section: ART 480 0101 University of Maryland Title HIST/THEORY IMAGING Instructor: MAHONEY, JAMES

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 130

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 8 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	~																	
								_	ncies				tructor	Course	_		Level	Sec
		Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
		General																
. Did you	gain n	ew insights,skil	ls from this	course	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	511/1669	4.57	4.26	4.23	4.39	4.5
. Did the	instru	ctor make clear	the expected	goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	841/1666	4.29	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.2
. Did the	exam q	uestions reflect	the expecte	d goals	1	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.47	4.24	4.38	4.0
. Did other	er eval	uations reflect	the expected	goals	1	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	641/1617	4.40	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.4
. Did ass:	igned r	eadings contribu	te to what y	ou learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	285/1555	4.57	3.73	4.00	4.08	4.5
		signments contril		you learned		0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	628/1543	4.29	3.85	4.06	4.18	4.2
		g system clearly			1	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50		4.50	3.97	4.12	4.14	
		was class cance			2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1668	5.00		4.67		5.0
. How woul	ld you	grade the overal	l teaching e	ffectivenes	s 1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	119/1605	4.86	4.13	4.07	4.16	4.8
		Lecture																
. Were the	e instr	uctor's lectures	well prepar	ed	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	308/1514	4.83	4.26	4.39	4.45	4.8
. Did the	instru	ctor seem intere	sted in the	subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.73	5.0
. Was lect	ture ma	terial presented	and explain	ed clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.22	4.24	4.27	5.0
. Did the	lectur	es contribute to	what you le	arned	2	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	838/1506	4.33	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.3
. Did aud:	iovisua	l techniques enh	ance your un	derstanding	2	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	445/1311	4.25	4.26	3.85	3.88	4.3
		Discuss	ion															
. Did clas	ss disc	ussions contribu		ou learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.17	4.05	4.26	5.0
		nts actively enc	_		3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	336/1502	4.80	4.37	4.26	4.46	4.8
		ctor encourage fa			3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.52	
		echniques succes			3	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	344/1006			4.00	4.21	4.3
		Seminar																
. Were ass	signed :	topics relevant		nced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.63	4.38	4.74	***
		ctor available f			7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	4.88	4.36	4.69	***
		rojects contribu			7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.48	***
		ons contribute to			7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	4.75	4.20	4.27	**:
		for grading made			7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.00		3.86	***
				Fred	quency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
					-													
redits Ear	rned	Cum. GPA	Exp	ected Grade:	5			Re	asons	3			Ту:	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge:	nera	.1				1	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	4
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 0 D 0																		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ſΉ
				P 0								_	respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot:	her					3						
				? 1														

University of Maryland Course Section: ART 484 0101 Title ADVANCED 3D ANIMATION

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: BAILEY, DAN

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 10

Page 131 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

					Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	 General															
1. Did you gain new		rom this course	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	151/1669	4.88	4.26	4.23	4.39	4.88
2. Did the instruct			2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	243/1666	4.75	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.75
3. Did the exam que	stions reflect the	expected goals	2	4	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	557/1421	4.50	4.47	4.24	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evalua	tions reflect the e	expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.30	4.15	4.22	5.00
5. Did assigned read	dings contribute to	what you learned	2	2	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	1227/1555	3.50	3.73	4.00	4.08	3.50
6. Did written assi	gnments contribute	to what you learned	2	3	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	1410/1543	3.00	3.85	4.06	4.18	3.00
7. Was the grading	system clearly exp	lained	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1647	5.00	3.97	4.12	4.14	5.00
8. How many times wa	as class cancelled		2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How would you gra	ade the overall tea	aching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	373/1605	4.50	4.13	4.07	4.16	4.50
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruc		l prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	505/1514	4.71	4.26	4.39	4.45	4.71
	or seem interested		3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture mate		2	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	323/1503	4.71	4.22	4.24	4.73	4.71
4. Did the lectures	_	-	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	225/1506	4.86	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.86
5. Did audiovisual		-	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	97/1311	4.86	4.26	3.85	3.88	4.86
J. Did addiovisual	ceciniiques emiance	your understanding	J	U	U	U	U	1	U	1.00	J//1311	1.00	4.20	3.03	3.00	1.00
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	sions contribute to	o what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	192/1490	4.83	4.17	4.05	4.26	4.83
2. Were all students	s actively encourag	ged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	306/1502	4.83	4.37	4.26	4.46	4.83
3. Did the instruct	or encourage fair a	and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	348/1489	4.83	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.83
4. Were special tech	hniques successful		4	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1006	****	4.06	4.00	4.21	****
	Laboratory															
1. Did the lab incre	-	of the material	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	***	****	4.20	4.61	****
		Frequ	iency	Dist	crib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re:	asons	•			Ту	ne			Majors	
CICUICS BAINEU	Cuiii. GFA	Expected Grades				1/6	720115	,			т у ј	20			a JULS	,

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

Course Section: ART 488 0101 University of Maryland

Title ADV TOPICS: COMPUTER A Baltimore County Instructor: REINSEL, JOSEPH (Instr. A) Fall 2006

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 132

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	1669/1669	1.33	4.26	4.23	4.39	1.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1648/1666	2.33	4.18	4.19	4.22	2.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1610/1617	2.00	4.30	4.15	4.22	2.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1539/1555	2.33	3.73	4.00	4.08	2.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1571/1647	2.67	3.97	4.12	4.14	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1627/1668	3.67	4.62	4.67	4.70	3.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	1585/1605	2.00	4.13	4.07	4.16	2.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1514/1514	1.50	4.26	4.39	4.45	1.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1477/1551	3.67	4.74	4.66	4.73	3.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1501/1503	2.25	4.22	4.24	4.27	2.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	1502/1506	1.67	4.20	4.26	4.29	1.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	1285/1311	1.67	4.26	3.85	3.88	1.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	4.17	4.05	4.26	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1475/1502	2.50	4.37	4.26	4.46	2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.50

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

Course Section: ART 488 0101 University of Maryland Page 133 Title ADV TOPICS: COMPUTER A Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Title ADV TOPICS: COMPUTER A Baltimore County
Instructor: (Instr. B) Fall 2006

Enrollment: 4

Questionnaires: 3 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	1669/1669	1.33	4.26	4.23	4.39	1.33
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1648/1666	2.33	4.18	4.19	4.22	2.33
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1610/1617	2.00	4.30	4.15	4.22	2.00
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1539/1555	2.33	3.73	4.00	4.08	2.33
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1571/1647	2.67	3.97	4.12	4.14	2.67
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1627/1668	3.67	4.62	4.67	4.70	3.67
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1501/1514	1.50	4.26	4.39	4.45	1.50
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1423/1503	2.25	4.22	4.24	4.27	2.25
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	4.17	4.05	4.26	3.00
				ed to participate	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1475/1502	2.50	4.37	4.26	4.46	2.50
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.50
				Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	auir	ed f	or Ma	aior	 S	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1			1									5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0													-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her					3						
				? 1														

Course Section: ART 489 0101 University of Maryl Title SENIOR PROJECTS Baltimore County Instructor: WORDEN, FRED Fall 2006

Enrollment:

14

University of Maryland Page 134
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

uestionnaires: 11	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
-------------------	---

							Fr	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	2	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rar	ık	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did 1101	. anin na	General w insights,skil	=	thia govern	0	0	0	1	1	4	_	1 10	1001/1	660	4.18	4.26	4.23	1 20	4.18
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	4	3	2		1001/1		4.18	4.26	4.23	4.39	4.18
		lestions reflect			0	3	0	1	1	1	4	4.25	814/1		4.00	4.10	4.19		4.00
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	4	0		4.25			4.25	4.47	4.15		4.25
		eadings contribu	_	_	0	1	0	2	1	3		3.90			3.90	3.73	4.15		3.90
				at you learned what you learned	0	3	0	0	4	1			1043/1		3.88	3.73	4.06		3.88
		signments contri s system clearly			0	1	0	0	2	4	_	4.20	926/1		4.20	3.97	4.12	4.16	
		was class cance	_	ea	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00		1668	5.00	4.62	4.12		5.00
	-			ng effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	,		4.40	4.13		4.16	
9. HOW WOL	uia you g	grade the overal	ii teaciii.	ng effectiveness	Т	U	U	U	U	0	4	4.40	499/1	1005	4.40	4.13	4.07	4.10	4.40
		Lecture	2																
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lectures	s well pr	epared	1	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1199/1	L514	4.00	4.26	4.39	4.45	4.00
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem intere	ested in	the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	512/1	L551	4.90	4.74	4.66	4.73	4.90
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presented	d and exp	lained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	932/1	L503	4.20	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.20
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to	what yo	u learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	770/1	L506	4.40	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.40
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enh	nance you	r understanding	1	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	174/1	1311	4.70	4.26	3.85	3.88	4.70
		- ·																	
1 5 1 1		Discuss			0	0	_	•	0	_	_	4 22	COO /1	400	4 22	4 15	4 05	4 06	4 22
		ussions contribu			2	0	0	0	2	2		4.33			4.33	4.17	4.05	4.26	4.33
		nts actively end			2	0	0	0	1	1			486/1		4.67	4.37	4.26	4.46	
		ctor encourage f		open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1		4.67			4.67	4.49		4.52	
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	sstul		2	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	322/1	1006	4.38	4.06	4.00	4.21	4.38
		Laborat	corv																
1. Did the	e lab ind	crease understar	-	the material	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	226	****	****	4.20	4.61	****
			. ,																
1 Did fi	ald avnar	Field V rience contribut		t vou learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	Λ	1 00	****/	5.Ω	****	2 50	4 22	3.94	****
I. DIG III	eid exper	Tence Contribut	Le co wiia	c you rearned	10	U	1	U	U	U	U	1.00		56		2.50	4.22	3.34	
				Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3				Тур	oe.			Majors	.
										- 									
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Grad	duate	е	0	Majo	r	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3				_				_	_		_	_			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nera	Τ				0	Unde	er-gi	rad 1	.1	Non-	major	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D 0											_				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0			Means t				ın
				P 0								_	resp	onse	es to b	e sign	uficar	ıt	
	I 0						her				1	1							
				? 1															

Course Section	: ART 491 0120	University of Maryland	Page 135
Title	SPECIAL STUDIES	Baltimore County	JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:	CHAN, IRENE	Fall 2006	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	1		

Questionnaires: 1 Student Course Evaluation Quest

			Frequencies In			Inst	structor Course Dept			UMBC Level		Sect				
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	insights, skills f	rom this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1173/1669	4.00	4.26	4.23	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instruct	or make clear the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.18	4.19	4.22	5.00
8. How many times w	as class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How would you gr	ade the overall te	aching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.13	4.07	4.16	5.00
		Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	ution	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Rea	sons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	

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

Course Section	: ART 494 0139	University of Maryland	Page 136
Title	INTERNSHIP	Baltimore County	JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:	THOMPSON, CALLA	Fall 2006	Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 2
Questionnaires: 1 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1669 1/1668 1/1605	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.70	5.00

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course Section: ART 494 0141 Page 137 Title INTERNSHIP JAN 18, 2007 Instructor: ABRAHAM, GUENET Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	6	
Questionnaires:	4	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque:	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.18	4.19	4.22	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.47	4.24	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.30	4.15	4.22	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1555	5.00	3.73	4.00	4.08	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learner	d 0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1543	5.00	3.85	4.06	4.18	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1647	5.00	3.97	4.12	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness			0	0	1	0	3	4.50	373/1605	4.75	4.13	4.07	4.16	4.50
Lecture														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1296/1311	1.00	4.26	3.85	3.88	1.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	58/ 58	1.00	2.50	4.22	3.94	1.00
Fre	quency	y Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	s			Re	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2		Re	 quir	ed f	or M	ajor:	 S	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	4

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

Course Section:	ART 495	0143	University of	Maryland	Page	138
Title	INDEP STU	DIO RESEARCH	Baltimore	County	JAN 18,	2007
Instructor:	THOMPSON,	CALLA	Fall	2006	Job IRBF	R3029

Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA Fall 2006 Enrollment: 1

Questionnaires:	1	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------------	---	---------	--------	------------	---------------

	Frequencies						Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1669	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.39	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1647	5.00	3.97	4.12	4.14	5.00

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

Course Section:	ART 495	0145	University o	of Maryland	Page	139
Title	INDEP STUD	DIO RESEARCH	Baltimore	County	JAN 18,	2007
Instructor:	COOK, CATH	łΥ	Fall	2006	Job IRB	R3029

Instructor:

Enrollment: 1 Questionnaires: 1

-				
Ctudant	('Ollred	Evaluation	Ougetion	ם אינ כמר

			Frequencies				Inst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1669	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.30	4.15	4.22	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.13	4.07	4.16	5.00
Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.73	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1311	3.00	4.26	3.85	3.88	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	5.00	4.34	5.00	5.00

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

Course Section:	ART 495 0	146	University o	f Maryland	Page 140
Title	INDEP STUDI	O RESEARCH	Baltimore	County	JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:	WORDEN, FRE	D (Instr. A)	Fall	2006	Job IRBR3029

Instructor: WORDEN, FRED (Instr. A)
Enrollment: 1

Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies					Instructor			Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions			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	1173/1669	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1410/1543	3.00	3.85	4.06	4.18	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1647	5.00	3.97	4.12	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.13	4.07	4.16	5.00

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

Course Section	: ART 495 0146	University of Maryland	Page 141
Title	INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH	Baltimore County	JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:	(Instr. B)	Fall 2006	Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 1
Questionnaires: 1
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5				Instructor 5 Mean Rank		Course Dept Mean Mear				Sect Mean			
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1173/1669	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1410/1543	3.00	3.85	4.06	4.18	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1647	5.00	3.97	4.12	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.70	5.00
Lecture														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1296/1311	3.00	4.26	3.85	3.88	1.00
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	n									

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

Course Section: ART 610 0101 University of Maryland Page 142
Title IMAG. DIGITAL SEMINAR Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Instructor: REINSEL, JOSEPH Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 8
Questionnaires: 3

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

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	4	5		tructor Rank		e Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General	 1															
1 Did vor	ı dəin ne	.w insights,ski	_	this course	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3 00	1596/166	9 3.00	4.26	4.23	4.35	3.00
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	1	1		1094/166			4.19	4.19	4.00
		ations reflect	_	-	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	496/161	7 4.50	4.30	4.15	4.24	4.50
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contribu	ute to w	hat you learned	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1553/155	5 1.50	3.73	4.00	4.07	1.50
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y explai:	ned	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1636/164	7 1.50	3.97	4.12	4.15	1.50
	-	was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/166	8 5.00	4.62	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How wou	ıld you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1274/160	5 3.67	4.13	4.07	4.13	3.67
		Lecture	е															
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lectures	s well p	repared	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1352/151	4 3.67	4.26	4.39	4.37	3.67
		tor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/155			4.66	4.72	5.00
				plained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33				4.24	4.22	4.33
		s contribute to			0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	,			4.26	4.24	4.33
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enl	nance yo	ur understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	189/131	1 4.67	4.26	3.85	3.89	4.67
		Discuss	sion															
				hat you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	340/149			4.05	4.18	4.67
				to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	486/150			4.26	4.46	4.67
		_		open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/148			4.29	4.44	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	sstul		0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/100	6 5.00	4.06	4.00	4.11	5.00
		Semina																
	_	_		announced theme	1	0	0	1	0	0	1		94/ 11			4.38	4.39	3.50
				vidual attention	1	0	0	0	0	1	1		50/ 9			4.36	4.38	4.50
_		ns contribute t		you learned	1	0 1	0 1	0	1	0	0 T	4.00	72/ 10			4.20	4.23	4.00
5. were cr	riteria i	or grading made	e clear		1	1	Τ	U	U	0	U	1.00	97/ 9	8 1.00	4.00	3.95	3.93	1.00
		Field V						_										
1. Did fie	eld exper	ience contribut	te to wh	at you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	38/ 5	8 4.00	2.50	4.22	4.53	4.00
				Frequ	ıency	7 Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Т	уре			Majors	\$
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	2	A 1		Re	 auir	ed fo	or Ma	iors	 3	0	 Gradua	 te	1	Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1			-									5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-	grad	2	Non-	-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0		Means			_	jh
				P 0			_						respon	ses to	be sigr	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot	her					3						
				? 1														

Course Section: ART 640 0101 Title

IMAGING & DIGITAL STUD

Instructor: COOK, CATHY

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 2

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 143 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questions	MD	NA	Fr 1	eque: 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean			Sect Mean
Quescions								Mean					Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1173/1669	4.00	4.26	4.23	4.35	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	549/1666	4.50	4.18	4.19	4.19	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.47	4.24	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.30	4.15	4.24	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.73	4.00	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	. 0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	895/1543	4.00	3.85	4.06	4.27	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1645/1647	1.00	3.97	4.12	4.15	1.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1190/1668	4.50	4.62	4.67	4.83	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1605	4.50	4.13	4.07	4.13	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1199/1514	4.00	4.26	4.39	4.37	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.22	4.24	4.22	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	4.20	4.26	4.24	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	587/1311	4.00	4.26	3.85	3.89	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.17	4.05	4.18	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.37	4.26	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.49	4.29	4.44	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.06	4.00	4.11	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	4.63	4.38	4.39	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.88	4.36	4.38	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	5.00	4.22	4.36	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 105	5.00	4.75	4.20	4.23	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 98	5.00	4.00	3.95	3.93	5.00
Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	
										- 				

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

Course Section: ART 690 0125 University of Maryland Page 144
Title IND. STUDIES Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 1

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

Questionnaires: 1

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Instr	actor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.35	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.18	4.19	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.30	4.15	4.24	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1647	5.00	3.97	4.12	4.15	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.13	4.07	4.13	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.26	4.39	4.37	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.22	4.24	4.22	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.20	4.26	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1311	5.00	4.26	3.85	3.89	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.17	4.05	4.18	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.37	4.26	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.44	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.06	4.00	4.11	5.00

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

Course Section: Art 690 0126

Title Ind. Studies

Questionnaires: 3

Instructor: Worden, Fred Enrollment: 0

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

- ·				
Ctudont	COLLEGA	Evaluation	Ollegtion	n \circ i r \circ

								Fr	eque	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 L																
1. Did yo	ou gain r	new insights,skil	lls fro	m this co	ourse	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	389/1669	****	4.14	4.23	4.02	4.67
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected go	oals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	****	3.93	4.19	4.11	5.00
3. Did th	ne exam ç	questions reflect	the e	xpected o	goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	****	4.00	4.24	4.11	5.00
4. Did ot	her eval	luations reflect	the ex	pected go	oals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	496/1617	****	4.02	4.15	3.99	4.50
	_	readings contribu		_		0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1555	****	4.12	4.00	3.92	5.00
		ssignments contr		o what yo	ou learned		0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	250/1543	****	3.98	4.06	3.86	4.67
	-	s was class cance				0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1668		4.72	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overal	ll teac	hing effe	ectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1605	****	3.90	4.07	3.96	5.00
		Lecture																	
		ructor's lectures				2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1514		4.30	4.39	4.32	5.00
		actor seem intere				2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1551	****	4.63	4.66	4.55	5.00
		aterial presented		_	_	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503		4.15	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did au	udiovisua	al techniques enh	nance y	our under	rstanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1311	****	4.14	3.85	3.68	5.00
1 5' 3 3		Discus		- 1 t-	3 3	_	^	^	^	0	0	-	F 00	1 / 1 4 6 6	حندندروس	4 11	4 05	2 05	F 00
		cussions contribu				2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1490	****	4.11	4.05	3.85	5.00
		ents actively end				2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1502	***	4.32	4.26	4.06	5.00
3. Did th	ne instru	uctor encourage i	air an	d open di	ıscussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	****	4.23	4.29	4.07	5.00
		Semina								•		_	= 00						
		topics relevant				2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 112		4.53	4.38	4.04	5.00
		ctor available				2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 97	****	4.23	4.36	4.19	5.00
	_	projects contribu		_		2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92		3.93	4.22	3.79	5.00
4. Did pr	resentati	ions contribute t	to what	you lear	rned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 105	****	4.17	4.20	3.94	5.00
					Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expect	ted Grades				Re	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3		Re	 quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	 S	0	Graduat	e	2	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0		Ge:	nera	.1				1	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0														
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	2	F P	0 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - I				_	Jh.
				I	0		Ot:	her					1	respons	CD CO 1	oc bigi	iiiicai	10	
G G-		NDM 600 0140		?	0	4		_E .	·7									D	. 145
Course Se					Un		sity		_								_	_	145
Title		IND. STUDIES					imor		_									JAN 18,	
Instructo		REINSEL, JOSEPH				ŀ	all	20	06								· ·	Job IRE	sk3029
Enrollmen		1		,	25		n 1		0										
Questionn	laires.	1		ì	Student Co	urse	Eval	uati	on Q	uesti	OHH	aire	2						
		Ougation				MD	NT 70	_	eque	ncies	1	_		ructor		Dept			Sect
		Questions 	• 				NA 	1 		3 		5 	Mean	Rank 	Mean	mean	Mean 	Mean 	Mean
1 54 -		General				_	^	^	^	0	0	-1	г оо	1 /1 660	г оо	4 00	4 00	4 35	F 00
_		new insights,skil				0	0	U	U	0	0		5.00	1/1669				4.35	5.00
		uctor make clear				0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666		4.18	4.19	4.19	5.00
		questions reflect		_	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421		4.47		4.33	5.00
		luations reflect				0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1617		4.30	4.15		5.00
6. Did wr	ritten as	ssignments contr	ibute t	o what yo	ou learned	. 0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1543	5.00	3.85	4.06	4.27	5.00

 Was the grading system clearly explained 	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1647	5.00	3.97	4.12	4.15	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.13	4.07	4.13	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	5.00	4.34	4.45	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 46	5.00	5.00	4.45	4.61	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	Λ	0	Λ	Λ	Λ	Λ	1	5.00	1/ 33	5 00	5 00	4 25	4 60	5 00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course Section: ART 720A 0101 University of Maryland Title WRTNG BY & ABOUT ARTIS

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: MAHONEY, JAMES

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 8

Page 146 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

		Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect
Questions			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	8	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.35	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.18	4.19	4.19	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.47	4.24	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	146/1617	4.83	4.30	4.15	4.24	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1555	5.00	3.73	4.00	4.07	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1543	5.00	3.85	4.06	4.27	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	150/1647	4.83	3.97	4.12	4.15	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.13	4.07	4.13	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.26	4.39	4.37	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.22	4.24	4.22	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.20	4.26	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	483/1311	4.20	4.26	3.85	3.89	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	192/1490	4.83	4.17	4.05	4.18	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	306/1502	4.83	4.37	4.26	4.46	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.44	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	Τ	0	Τ	0	4	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.06	4.00	4.11	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	4.63	4.38	4.39	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.88	4.36	4.38	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	5.00	4.22	4.36	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 105	5.00	4.75	4.20	4.23	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 98	5.00	4.00	3.95	3.93	5.00
P		D.L.			_									
Frequ	.ency	ואוע	tribi	11101	1									

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

Course Section: ART 740 0101 University of Ma:
Title ADV. I&D STUDIO Baltimore Course Instructor: COOK, CATHY Fall 200

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

5

University of Maryland Page 147
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.35	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.18	4.19	4.19	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.47	4.24	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.30	4.15	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.73	4.00	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1543	5.00	3.85	4.06	4.27	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1647	5.00	3.97	4.12	4.15	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.13	4.07	4.13	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.26	4.39	4.37	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.22	4.24	4.22	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.20	4.26	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1311	5.00	4.26	3.85	3.89	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.17	4.05	4.18	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1502	5.00	4.37	4.26	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.44	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.06	4.00	4.11	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	4.63	4.38	4.39	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.88	4.36	4.38	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	5.00	4.22	4.36	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 105	5.00	4.75	4.20	4.23	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 98	5.00	4.00	3.95	3.93	5.00
	-	ŭ	Ü	•	Ü	Ū	_	3.00	1, 50	5.00	1.00	3.23	3.23	3.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ution	n									

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Course Section: ART 790 0139

3

IND. STUDIES

REINSEL, JOSEPH

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 148

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies					Instr	uator	Course Dept		TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	-	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.35	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.18	4.19	4.19	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.47	4.24	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.30	4.15	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1555	5.00	3.73	4.00	4.07	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1543	5.00	3.85	4.06	4.27	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1647		3.97	4.12	4.15	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.13	4.07	4.13	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1514		4.26	4.39	4.37	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1551		4.74	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503		4.22	4.24	4.22	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506		4.20	4.26	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1311	5.00	4.26	3.85	3.89	5.00
_,														
Discussion	0		0	•	•	0	0	F 00	7 / 7 400	F 00	4 10	4 05	4 10	F 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490		4.17	4.05	4.18	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502		4.37	4.26	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489		4.49	4.29	4.44	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.06	4.00	4.11	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	5.00	4.34	4.45	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 42		5.00	4.31	4.40	5.00
	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 42		5.00	4.45	4.40	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	-		-	-	-	1		,					
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	_,		5.00	4.25	4.60	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	1/ 29	5.00	5.00	4.34	5.00	5.00

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