Baltimore County

Course-Section: ART 210 0101

15

VISUAL CONCEPTS

BRADLEY, STEPHE

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Page 63 JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

- ·				
Ctudant	COLLEGA	Evaluation	Ollegtion	n a r a

							Fr	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	5	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	549/1481	4.30	4.41	4.29	4.40	4.50
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	6	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1130/1481	3.94	4.30	4.23	4.29	3.89
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	5	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.36	****
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	5	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1160/1424	4.05	4.35	4.21	4.28	3.80
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	1210/1396	3.28	3.80	3.98	3.94	3.22
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	6	0	1	1	0	4	3	3.78	974/1342	3.11	3.68	4.07	4.05	3.78
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	6	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	1063/1459	4.14	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.89
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	702/1480	4.80	4.63	4.68	4.68	4.90
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1081/1450	3.94	4.22	4.09	4.15	3.78
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	514/1409	4.70	4.44	4.42	4.47	4.70
		ctor seem inter			5	0	0	0	0	3	7		- ,		4.82	4.69	4.78	4.70
				xplained clearly	5	0	0		3	3	4		,		4.40	4.26	4.29	4.10
		es contribute t			5	0	0	0	3	2	_	4.20	,		4.35	4.27	4.34	
				our understanding	5	0	0	0	1	1		4.70			4.49	3.96		4.70
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al	acc dica			what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	610/1262	4.10	4.22	4.05	4.11	4.20
				d to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2		4.60			4.50	4.29	4.34	4.60
				d open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	3	5		742/1256		4.51	4.30	4.28	4.30
		echniques succe		a open discussion	5	7	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 788		4.19	4.00	3.98	****
						- -			_									
				Freq	lency	DIS	trib	utioi	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	ре			Majors	;
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 2		Re	guir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 5			-			_						J -		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									J				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		El	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ıh
				P 0									respons					
				I 0		Ot]	her					8	_					

? 1

Course-Section: ART 210 0301
Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
Instructor: SHIFLET, NICOLE

13

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 64 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

							Fr	eaue:	ncies	:		Inst	tructo	r	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rai	_		Mean		Mean	Mean
		 General																	
1. Did voi	u gain n	ew insights,skil		this course	3	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	1006/	1481	4.30	4.41	4.29	4.40	4.10
_		ctor make clear			3	0	0	1	2	3	4		1000/		3.94	4.30	4.23	4.29	4.00
		uations reflect			3	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	684/		4.05	4.35	4.21	4.28	4.30
		eadings contribu	_	_	3	4	1	0	2	2	1		1167/		3.28	3.80	3.98	3.94	
				what you learned	3	1	2	2	4	1	0		1329/		3.11	3.68	4.07	4.05	2.44
		g system clearly			3	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	611/		4.14	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.40
		was class cance		1100	3	0	0	0	0	3	7		928/		4.80	4.63	4.68	4.68	4.70
	-			ing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	2					4.22	4.09	4.15	4.11
		Lecture																	
Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures	well p	repared	3	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	514/	1409	4.70	4.44	4.42	4.47	4.70
. Did the	e instru	ctor seem intere	sted in	the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	500/	1407	4.80	4.82	4.69	4.78	4.90
. Was le	cture ma	terial presented	and ex	plained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	335/	1399	4.40	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.70
. Did the	e lectur	es contribute to	what y	ou learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	492/	1400	4.40	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.60
. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enh	ance yo	ur understanding	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	111/	1179	4.75	4.49	3.96	4.05	4.80
		Discuss	ion																
. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contribu	te to w	hat you learned	5	0	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	708/	1262	4.10	4.22	4.05	4.11	4.00
. Were a	ll stude	nts actively enc	ouraged	to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	489/	1259	4.61	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.63
. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage f	air and	open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	496/	1256	4.46	4.51	4.30	4.28	4.63
. Were s	pecial t	echniques succes	sful	_	5	4	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	176/	788	4.50	4.19	4.00	3.98	4.50
		Laborat	ory																
. Did the	e lab in	crease understan	ding of	the material	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	246	****	****	4.20	4.51	****
. Were ye	ou provi	ded with adequat	e backg	round information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	249	****	****	4.11	4.32	***
. Were no	ecessary	materials avail	able fo	r lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	242	****	****	4.40	4.63	***
. Did the	e lab in	structor provide	assist	ance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	240	****	****	4.20	4.58	****
		Seminar																	
_		ons contribute t		you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/	69	****	5.00	4.35	4.72	****
. Were c	riteria	for grading made	clear		12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	68	****	4.89	3.92	3.55	****
		Field W																	
		rience contribut			12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/	59	****	5.00	4.30	4.67	****
_		y understand you			12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/	51	****	5.00	4.00	4.07	****
		could you discu			12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/	41	****	5.00	4.26	4.69	****
. Did co	nference	s help you carry	out fi	eld activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	31	****	5.00	4.42	4.80	****
		Self P																	
	_	system contribu		_	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/	55	****	4.83	4.55	4.44	****
. Were y	our cont	acts with the in	structo	r helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	51	****	5.00	4.65	4.66	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio:	n										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	1				Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	 quir	ed f	 or Ma	jors	 3	0	Grad	duat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 2													-		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ger	nera	1				0	Und	er-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	###:	# - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	rh
				P 0											es to k				
				т 0		O+1	h 0 30					0						-	

Other

9

I 0

? 0

Course-Section: ART 211 0101 University of Maryland Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM Baltimore County Instructor: Silberg, Steven

Spring 2006

Page 65

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	15	
Questionnaires:	15	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								_	ncies	5			tructor		_	UMBC		
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did v	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	3	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	395/1481	4.52	4.41	4.29	4.40	4.67
_	_	ctor make clear			3	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	909/1481		4.30	4.23	4.29	4.17
		estions reflec			3	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	611/1249		4.32	4.27	4.36	4.42
	_	ations reflect		_	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	217/1424		4.35	4.21	4.28	4.75
				what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	5	3	3.75	918/1396		3.80	3.98	3.94	3.75
				o what you learned	3	0	0	0	5	5	2				3.68	4.07	4.05	3.75
		g system clearl			3	0	0	2	3	2	5		1101/1459		4.02	4.16	4.17	3.83
		was class canc			3	0	0	0	1	9	2	4.08	1329/1480	4.51	4.63	4.68	4.68	4.08
	-			hing effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	4	4		546/1450		4.22	4.09	4.15	4.33
		Lectur	е															
1. Were	the instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	3	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	1031/1409	4.29	4.44	4.42	4.47	4.25
2. Did tl	he instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	659/1407	4.64	4.82	4.69	4.78	4.83
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	1	7	4.17	910/1399	4.27	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.17
4. Did tl	he lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	591/1400	4.26	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.50
5. Did a	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	384/1179	4.43	4.49	3.96	4.05	4.33
		Discus																
				what you learned	3	0	0	2	0	2	8	4.33	507/1262		4.22	4.05	4.11	4.33
				d to participate	3	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	729/1259		4.50	4.29	4.34	4.33
		_		d open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	571/1256		4.51	4.30	4.28	4.50
4. Were	special te	echniques succe	ssful		3	4	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	394/ 788	3.67	4.19	4.00	3.98	4.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
a 1'.	_ 1	a ana		1 . 1				_					_					
Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	.jor	 s	1	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	в 6														
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0													-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - :	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	gh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her				1	.1	_		_			
				? 0														

Course-Section: ART 211 0201 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM Instructor:

CAZABON, LYNN Spring 2006

I

?

0

1

Enrollment: 17

Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 66

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

							Fr	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 vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	292/1481	4.52	4.41	4.29	4.40	4.75
_	-	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	228/1481	4.25	4.30	4.23	4.29	4.75
		uestions reflec			0	13	0	0	1	0	2		****/1249	4.42	4.32	4.27	4.36	***
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	217/1424	4.50	4.35	4.21	4.28	4.75
				what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	7	4	3.75	918/1396		3.80	3.98	3.94	3.75
	-	-		to what you learned	0	1	2	1	5	3	4	3.40	1166/1342	3.61	3.68	4.07	4.05	3.40
		g system clearl		_	0	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	775/1459	4.00	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.25
		was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	936/1480	4.51	4.63	4.68	4.68	4.69
				ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	651/1450	4.07	4.22	4.09	4.15	4.23
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	618/1409	4.29	4.44	4.42	4.47	4.63
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	568/1407	4.64	4.82	4.69	4.78	4.88
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	502/1399	4.27	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.56
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	591/1400	4.26	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.50
				our understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	108/1179	4.43	4.49	3.96	4.05	4.81
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	236/1262	4.43	4.22	4.05	4.11	4.71
				ed to participate	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	402/1259	4.58	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.71
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	320/1256	4.61	4.51	4.30	4.28	4.79
		echniques succe		-	2	5	1	0	4	1	3	3.56	594/ 788	3.67	4.19	4.00	3.98	3.56
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Guadina B		G GD3		The section of Consider				ъ.									20-2	
Credits E	.arnea	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				ке:	asons	; 			Ту	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### -				_	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
				_		_												

Other

12

Course-Section: ART 211 0301

Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM

Instructor: D'AGOSTINO, BRI

Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 67 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	957/1481	4.52	4.41	4.29	4.40	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	0	5	1	6		1154/1481	4.25	4.30	4.23	4.29	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	10	0	1	0	1	1		****/1249	4.42	4.32	4.27	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	2	3	1	7	4.00	959/1424		4.35	4.21	4.28	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	3	2	1	4		1239/1396		3.80	3.98	3.94	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	3	4	3		1039/1342	3.61	3.68	4.07	4.05	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	1039/1459	4.00	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	880/1480	4.51	4.63	4.68	4.68	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	3	3	3	3.64	1174/1450	4.07	4.22	4.09	4.15	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	2	1	1	8		1152/1409	4.29	4.44	4.42	4.47	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	4	7		1272/1407		4.82	4.69	4.78	4.21
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	2	2	7	4.08	976/1399	4.27	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	4	1	6		1140/1400		4.35	4.27	4.34	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	2	2	1	8	4.15	518/1179	4.43	4.49	3.96	4.05	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	583/1262	4.43	4.22	4.05	4.11	4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	422/1259	4.58	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	554/1256	4.61	4.51	4.30	4.28	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	2	3	1	4	3.45	627/ 788	3.67	4.19	4.00	3.98	3.45
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.51	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.58	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.28	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 68	****	4.89	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.68	4.53	4.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.72	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 68	****	4.89	3.92	3.55	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.67	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.00	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.42	4.80	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 55	****	4.83	4.55	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.66	****

Course-Section: ART 211 0301

Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM

Instructor: D'AGOSTINO, BRI

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 16

Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 67 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

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

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 68

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 15 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Questionnaires: 13

SLONE, JASON

Instructor:

			Fre	eanei	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	0	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	395/1481	3.52	4.41	4.29	4.40	4.67
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	∠ 1	0	9	4.67	395/1481	3.34	4.41	4.29	4.40	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1249		4.30	4.23	4.29	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1 0	0	0	0	2	0	4.73	240/1424		4.35	4.21	4.28	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	5	0	2	3.75	918/1396		3.80	3.98	3.94	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	683/1342		3.68	4.07	4.05	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	4.09	914/1459	2.91	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	5		1107/1480		4.63	4.68	4.68	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	238/1450		4.22	4.09	4.15	4.64
or non-would fou grade one everall seasoning erresorveness	_	_	ŭ	ŭ	Ü	-	•	1.01	2507 2150	3.33		1.05	1115	1.01
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	319/1409	3.76	4.44	4.42	4.47	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1407	4.75	4.82	4.69	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	129/1399	3.80	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	239/1400	3.64	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	88/1179	4.34	4.49	3.96	4.05	4.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	507/1262	3.77	4.22	4.05	4.11	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	336/1259	4.33	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	332/1256	4.47	4.51	4.30	4.28	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 788	2.83	4.19	4.00	3.98	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	•	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0		11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ART 212 0201

Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D

Instructor: REINSEL, JOSEPH

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 17

Spring

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 69 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Ran		Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera:	 l																
1. Did vo	u gain new	w insights,ski		m this course	3	0	1	3	9	1	0	2.71	1473/1	481	3.52	4.41	4.29	4.40	2.71
_	_	tor make clear			3	0	4	4	4	2	0	2.29	1474/1	481	3.34	4.30	4.23	4.29	2.29
		estions reflect			3	12	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1	249	3.35	4.32	4.27	4.36	****
4. Did oth	her evalua	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	4	1	2	1	4	5	0	3.00	1361/1	424	3.68	4.35	4.21	4.28	3.00
5. Did ass	signed rea	adings contrib	ite to	what you learned	4	0	4	1	6	0	2	2.62	1357/1	396	2.97	3.80	3.98	3.94	2.62
6. Did wr	itten ass:	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	4	12	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1	342	3.64	3.68	4.07	4.05	****
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	4	2	7	2	2	0	0	1.55	1450/1	459	2.91	4.02	4.16	4.17	1.55
8. How man	ny times v	was class cance	elled		3	1	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	989/1	480	4.60	4.63	4.68	4.68	4.62
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	6	1	2	1	6	1	0	2.60	1422/1	450	3.55	4.22	4.09	4.15	2.60
		Lecture	_																
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture:	s well	prepared	6	0	3	1	4	1	2	2.82	1383/1	409	3.76	4.44	4.42	4.47	2.82
2. Did the	e instruct	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	6	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	1076/1	407	4.75	4.82	4.69	4.78	4.55
3. Was led	cture mate	erial presented	d and e	xplained clearly	6	0	2	0	4	5	0	3.09	1316/1	399	3.80	4.40	4.26	4.29	3.09
4. Did the	e lectures	s contribute to	what	you learned	7	1	0	5	0	4	0	2.89	1336/1	400	3.64	4.35	4.27	4.34	2.89
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	6	1	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	557/1	179	4.34	4.49	3.96	4.05	4.10
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cla	ass discus	ssions contrib	ate to	what you learned	7	0	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	913/1	262	3.77	4.22	4.05	4.11	3.70
				d to participate	7	0	2	0	2	2	4	3.60	1079/1	259	4.33	4.50	4.29	4.34	3.60
		-	_	d open discussion	7	0	2	0	0	1	7	4.10	860/1		4.47	4.51	4.30	4.28	4.10
		chniques succes			7	7	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/	788				3.98	***
		Labora	cory																
2. Were yo	ou provide	ed with adequa	te back	ground information	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	249	****	****	4.11	4.32	***
		Field V	Work																
1. Did fie	eld exper:	ience contribu	te to w	hat you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	59	****	5.00	4.30	4.67	****
2. Did you	u clearly	understand you	ır eval	uation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	51	****	5.00	4.00	4.07	****
		Self 1																	
1. Did se	lf-paced a	system contrib	ite to	what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	55	****	4.83	4.55	4.44	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	n										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons					Тур	pe			Majors	5
00-27	 2	0.00-0.99	 0	A 5			าแรก	 ed f	or Ma	iore	. – – – !	0	 Grad	112+4		0	Majo	 nr	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5		1/6/	darr.	cu I	or ma	בייינ	,	U	Grau	uace	-	U	ria J	<i>)</i> <u> </u>	U
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	В 3 С 2		Cor	nera	1				0	Unde	r_c	rad 1	.7	Non	-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0		Gel	иста.	_				U	unde	<u>-91</u>	Lau I	. /	11011-	iiia JUL	O
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5 5	Б 0 F 0		וק.	ecti	7700				1	####	_ 1	Means t	here =	re not	enouc	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	J	P 0		E16	CCLI	v C D				_			means t es to b			_	111
				I 0		∩+1	her				1	1	resp	01156	ש נט ג	o algi.	ııııcal	10	
				? 1		ULI	TICI					_							

Course-Section: ART 212 0301 University of Maryland Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D Instructor: REINSEL, JOSEPH

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 15

Page 70 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questic	onnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------	---------

	Frequenc			ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
	-	0	0	2	_	_	1	2 07	1444/1401	2 50	4 41	4 00	4 40	2 07
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	3	2	6	Ţ		1444/1481				4.40	3.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	Τ	0	2	3	4	5	0		1448/1481	3.34	4.30	4.23	4.29	2.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	Τ	10	0	0	2	2	0		1118/1249		4.32	4.27	4.36	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	4	4	3	3		1311/1424		4.35	4.21	4.28	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	3	5	1	1		1365/1396		3.80	3.98	3.94	2.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	1	0	1	0	0		****/1342		3.68	4.07	4.05	****
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	2	0	2	4	2	2	3	3.00	1380/1459	2.91	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	1146/1480	4.60	4.63	4.68	4.68	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	3	8	0	3.46	1240/1450	3.55	4.22	4.09	4.15	3.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	Λ	4	5	4	4 00	1152/1409	3.76	4.44	4.42	4.47	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	636/1407	4.75	4.82	4.69	4.78	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	3	2	4		1213/1399		4.40	4.26	4.78	3.62
		0	1	2	2	5	3		1213/1399		4.35	4.20	4.29	3.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	Τ	2	2	5								
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	U	U	Τ	Τ	5	6	4.23	457/1179	4.34	4.49	3.96	4.05	4.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	4	0	3.43	1026/1262	3.77	4.22	4.05	4.11	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	661/1259	4.33	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	532/1256		4.51	4.30	4.28	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 788	2.83	4.19	4.00	3.98	****
1. Here Spectar committaes Successivat	O	Ü	3	3	3	-	O	2.00	, , , , , ,	2.03	1.10	1.00	5.70	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other 13		-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 212 0401 University of Maryland Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 71

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 15

DROGOUL, LAURE

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies				Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect					
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	4	0	2	0	2	3	4	3.64	1311/1481	3.52	4.41	4.29	4.40	3.64
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	4	0	1	0	4	4	2	3.55	1306/1481	3.34	4.30	4.23	4.29	3.55
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	4	6	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1174/1249	3.35	4.32	4.27	4.36	3.20
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	4	0	1	2	2	1	5	3.64	1233/1424	3.68	4.35	4.21	4.28	3.64
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	8	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1396	2.97	3.80	3.98	3.94	* * * *
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	4	5	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1234/1342	3.64	3.68	4.07	4.05	3.17
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	5	3	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1380/1459	2.91	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.00
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1480	4.60	4.63	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	7	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	1223/1450	3.55	4.22	4.09	4.15	3.50
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	5	0	2	0	1	6	1	3.40	1311/1409	3.76	4.44	4.42	4.47	3.40
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	5	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	1031/1407	4.75	4.82	4.69	4.78	4.60
3. Was le	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	2	1	6	1	3.60	1217/1399	3.80	4.40	4.26	4.29	3.60
4. Did th	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				5	0	2	0	2	5	1	3.30	1275/1400	3.64	4.35	4.27	4.34	3.30
5. Did au	id audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding			our understanding	5	1	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	549/1179	4.34	4.49	3.96	4.05	4.11
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	958/1262	3.77	4.22	4.05	4.11	3.60
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	5	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	588/1259	4.33	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.50
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	636/1256	4.47	4.51	4.30	4.28	4.44
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful		6	3	0	3	2	0	1	2.83	737/ 788	2.83	4.19	4.00	3.98	2.83
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0			Red	auir	ed f	or Ma			0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 4		1000	2411	ca I	O1 11C	-) 🗆	~	~	Gradaac	_	•	110000	-	3
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	.5	Non-	-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	B 0		00.	a	-				Ü	orract 3			21011		J
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0 P 0	Electives					0	#### - respons				_	ıh		

Other

9

0

0

I ? Course-Section: ART 213 0101 University of Maryland Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 72

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: COOK, CATHY Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 15 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies In			Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	1	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this cou	rse 7		0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1481	4.50	4.41	4.29	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goa	ls 6		0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	210/1481	4.23	4.30	4.23	4.29	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected go	als 6		7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1249	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goa	ls 6		0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	287/1424	4.49	4.35	4.21	4.28	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you le	earned 6		3	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	193/1396	3.63	3.80	3.98	3.94	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you	learned 6		1	1	2	1	1	3	3.38	1174/1342	3.12	3.68	4.07	4.05	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6		0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1201/1459	3.60	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	6		0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1316/1480	4.48	4.63	4.68	4.68	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effec	tiveness 6		0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	417/1450	3.89	4.22	4.09	4.15	4.44
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6		0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	839/1409	4.29	4.44	4.42	4.47	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subj	ect 6		0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1407	4.75	4.82	4.69	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained c	learly 6		0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	513/1399	4.16	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	d 6		0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	541/1400	4.18	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your unders	tanding 7		0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1179	4.59	4.49	3.96	4.05	5.00
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you le	earned 8		0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	418/1262	4.24	4.22	4.05	4.11	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to partic	cipate 8		0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	402/1259	4.58	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open dis-	cussion 8		0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	406/1256	4.18	4.51	4.30	4.28	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	8		4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 788	3.66	4.19	4.00	3.98	****
	Frequenc	У	Dist	ribu	tion	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected	d Grades				Rea	sons				Туј	pe			Majors	ŀ
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A	 6	 Re			d fo	or Ma	jors	 S	0	Graduat	 e	0	 Majo	 or	0

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	6
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	
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other		_			
				?	0	0 01101					

Course-Section: ART 213 0201 Title

VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D

Instructor: COOK, CATHY

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 73 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions				_	ncies		_		ructor	Course	_			Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	428/1481	4.50	4.41	4.29	4.40	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	361/1481	4.23	4.30	4.23	4.29	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	6	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	624/1249	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.36	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	2	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	201/1424	4.49	4.35	4.21	4.28	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	0	5	1	3	3.78	901/1396	3.63	3.80	3.98	3.94	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	3	0	1	4	1	2		1115/1342	3.12	3.68	4.07	4.05	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	732/1459	3.60	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	928/1480	4.48	4.63	4.68	4.68	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	630/1450	3.89	4.22	4.09	4.15	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	826/1409	4.29	4.44	4.42	4.47	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	997/1407	4.75	4.82	4.69	4.78	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	523/1399	4.16	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	239/1400	4.18	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1179	4.59	4.49	3.96	4.05	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	400/1262	4.24	4.22	4.05	4.11	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	451/1259	4.58	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	543/1256	4.18	4.51	4.30	4.28	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	209/ 788	3.66	4.19	4.00	3.98	4.43
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.51	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.58	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.28	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.89	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 69	****	4.68	4.53	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 63	****	5.00	4.44	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.72	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	***	4.89	3.92	3.55	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.67	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.00	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.64	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	5.00	4.26	4.69	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.42	4.80	***
From	onati	Dia	+ wil	+ i o	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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there a	are not enough	L

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 11 0

Course-Section: ART 213 0301 University of Maryland Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D Baltimore County ROBBINS, STEPHA Instructor:

Spring 2006

Page 74

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	11			
Questionnaires:	10	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

? 0

					1		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 voi	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	362/1481	4.50	4.41	4.29	4.40	4.70
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	517/1481	4.23	4.30	4.23	4.29	4.50
		estions reflec			0	6	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	498/1249	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.36	4.50
	_	ations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	557/1424		4.35	4.21	4.28	4.40
				what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	839/1396	3.63	3.80	3.98	3.94	3.86
				o what you learned	0	5	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1166/1342	3.12	3.68	4.07	4.05	3.40
		g system clearl			1	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1063/1459	3.60	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.89
		was class cand			1	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1349/1480	4.48	4.63	4.68	4.68	4.00
9. How wou	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	6	0	3.75	1098/1450	3.89	4.22	4.09	4.15	3.75
		Lectur		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_							
		uctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	2	3	5		1001/1409			4.42	4.47	4.30
		ctor seem inter		3	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	728/1407		4.82	4.69	4.78	4.80
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	7		,		4.40	4.26	4.29	4.60
			ontribute to what you learned			0	0	0	2	3	5		,		4.35	4.27	4.34	4.30
5. Did auc	diovisual	l techniques en	enhance your understanding			1	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	124/1179	4.59	4.49	3.96	4.05	4.78
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	862/1262	4.24	4.22	4.05	4.11	3.80
				d to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	3		,		4.50	4.29	4.34	4.40
				d open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	809/1256	4.18	4.51	4.30	4.28	4.20
		echniques succe			5	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	533/ 788	3.66	4.19	4.00	3.98	3.75
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	Reasons						Ту	ре			Majors	;		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors			 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo		0			
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 6		100	-1		- 110	. , 0	-	•	SEGGGG	_	Ü	.10.50	-	Ü
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 0 Under-grad			rad 1	.0	Non-	major	2						
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	5 5 5 1 4 4 1 6 5 1 4 1 6 5 1 4 1 6 5 1 4 1 6 5 1 4 1 6 5 1 4 1 6 5 1 6			-		5	=							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0 #### - Means th			here a	re not	enou	rh							
				P 0							_	•						
I 0 Other				8	-		3											

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

0

0

I

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 75

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 8 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

0

3.50-4.00 1

Grad.

DAVIS, PHIL

								_	ncies		_		tructor		Dept		Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.41	4.29	4.40	4.50
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	942/1481	4.23	4.30	4.23	4.29	4.13
4. Did oth	ner eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	595/1424	4.49	4.35	4.21	4.28	4.38
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1136/1396	3.63	3.80	3.98	3.94	3.40
6. Did wri	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	5	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1186/1342	3.12	3.68	4.07	4.05	3.33
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1154/1459	3.60	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.75
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	912/1480	4.48	4.63	4.68	4.68	4.71
9. How wor	ıld you 🤉	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	997/1450	3.89	4.22	4.09	4.15	3.88
		Lectur	_															
		uctor's lecture			1 1	0	0	0	3	1	3		1152/1409		4.44		4.47	
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	1	2	4		1168/1407	4.75	4.82	4.69	4.78	4.43
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				1	0	0	1	2	2	2		1178/1399		4.40	4.26	4.29	3.71
				-	1	0	0	1	2	1	3		1104/1400		4.35	4.27	4.34	3.86
5. Did auc	diovisua.	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	419/1179	4.59	4.49	3.96	4.05	4.29
		Discus																
المالية المالة				what you learned	-	0	0	0	0	1	2	1 67	264/1262	4 04	4 22	4 05	4.11	1 67
				ed to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	4.67 5.00	264/1262 1/1259		4.22	4.05	4.11	4.67 5.00
		_	_	d to participate d open discussion	5 5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1259		4.50	4.29	4.34	5.00
		echniques succe		d open discussion	5 5	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 788		4.19	4.00	3.98	****
4. Were St	pecial to	eciniiques succe	SSIUI		5	2	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	700	3.00	4.13	4.00	3.90	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
				-	-													
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	1			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	в 4			_			-						_		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 0			0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	1				
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														

Electives

Other

0

8

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 213 0501 University of Maryla Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D Baltimore County Instructor: BRADLEY, STEPHE Spring 2006

I 0

? 1

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 13

13

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2006

Page 76

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

_			
Ctudant	College	Proplustion	Ouestionnaire

	Questions					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 yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	4	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1299/1481	4.50	4.41	4.29	4.40	3.67
		ctor make clear			4	0	0	3	3	2	1	3.11	1410/1481	4.23	4.30	4.23	4.29	3.11
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	4	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1249	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.36	****
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	4	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	773/1424	4.49	4.35	4.21	4.28	4.22
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	1	3	5	0	0	2.44	1372/1396	3.63	3.80	3.98	3.94	2.44
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	4	0	3	3	3	0	0	2.00	1340/1342	3.12	3.68	4.07	4.05	2.00
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	4	1	2	1	5	0	0	2.38	1433/1459	3.60	4.02	4.16	4.17	2.38
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	729/1480	4.48	4.63	4.68	4.68	4.89
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	6	0	0	2	3	1	1	3.14	1333/1450	3.89	4.22	4.09	4.15	3.14
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	5	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1031/1409	4.29	4.44	4.42	4.47	4.25
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	568/1407	4.75	4.82	4.69	4.78	4.88
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	5	0	0	3	1	2	2	3.38	1267/1399	4.16	4.40	4.26	4.29	3.38
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	5	0	0	2	3	1	2	3.38	1261/1400	4.18	4.35	4.27	4.34	3.38
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	5	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	712/1179	4.59	4.49	3.96	4.05	3.88
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	829/1262	4.24	4.22	4.05	4.11	3.86
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	6	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	846/1259	4.58	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.14
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	d open discussion	6	0	3	0	3	0	1	2.43	1225/1256	4.18	4.51	4.30	4.28	2.43
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful		6	2	1	2	0	1	1	2.80	740/ 788	3.66	4.19	4.00	3.98	2.80
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Per	 mir		 or Ma	ajors		0	 Graduat		0	Majo		0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 4		re(4urr,	=u 1(J⊥ I*lc	JOLS	•	U	Graduat	C	U	Ma JC	, <u> </u>	U
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0		001	u.	-				-	onder 9	1		1,011		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ectiv	zes.				0	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enone	rh
JI da.	Ü	3.30 1.00	P 0								•	respons				_		

Other

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ART 214 0101

DRAWING I

12

CHAN, IRENE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

Page 77 JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

							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 1101	u gain no	Genera w insights,ski	_	this sourse	2	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	678/1481	4.45	4.41	4.29	4.40	4.40
		tor make clear			2	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	769/1481		4.30	4.23	4.29	4.30
		estions reflec			2	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	334/1249	4.73	4.32	4.27	4.36	4.67
	_	ations reflect		_	2	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.40	557/1424		4.35	4.21	4.28	4.40
			_	what you learned	2	5	0	2	1	1	1		1218/1396		3.80	3.98	3.94	3.20
				what you learned	2	0	2	2	5	0	1		1324/1342		3.68	4.07	4.05	2.60
		system clearly		-	2	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	909/1459	3.80	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.10
		was class canc		inea	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480		4.63	4.68	4.68	5.00
	-			ning effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	761/1450		4.22	4.09	4.15	4.13
9. HOW WO	uiu you gi	lade the overa	II teati	iling effectiveness	3		U	U	U	,		4.13	701/1430	4.33	4.22	4.03	4.13	4.13
		Lectur	е															
		ctor's lecture	_	_	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	514/1409	4.70	4.44	4.42	4.47	4.70
2. Did the	e instruct	tor seem inter	ested in	n the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	785/1407	4.84	4.82	4.69	4.78	4.78
				xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	376/1399	4.68	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.67
4. Did the	e lectures	s contribute to	o what y	you learned	4	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	969/1400	4.31	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.13
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	nance yo	our understanding	3	2	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	590/1179	4.00	4.49	3.96	4.05	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discus			what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	507/1262	4.11	4.22	4.05	4.11	4.33
				d to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	451/1259	4.56	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.67
				d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	332/1256	4.61	4.51	4.30	4.28	4.78
		chniques succe		open arroaderen	3	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	105/ 788		4.19	4.00	3.98	
•	-	-																
_		Labora	-				_	_	_	_	_							
				ground information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.32	****
3. Were n	ecessary r	materials avai	lable fo	or lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.63	***
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	n									
Crodita E	awnod	Cham CDA		Ermostad Crados				Dos		-			т				Mojews	
	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gr								asons	5 			Ту:				Majors	;
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 5														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera!	L				1	Under-g	rad 1	2	Non-	-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1				_	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ıfican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ıer					9						

University of Maryland
Baltimore County

Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 78

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 16
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

?

0

Course-Section: ART 214 0201

DRAWING I

GARDNER, SYMMES

Title

Instructor:

							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 gain ne	w insights,ski	_	n this course	2	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	549/1481	4.45	4.41	4.29	4.40	4.50
		tor make clear			2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	264/1481	4.51	4.30	4.23	4.29	4.71
		estions reflec			2	9	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	203/1249	4.73	4.32	4.27	4.36	4.80
	_	ations reflect		_	2	1	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	406/1424	4.47	4.35	4.21	4.28	4.54
			-	what you learned	2	1	3	0	4	2	4		1181/1396	3.25	3.80	3.98	3.94	3.31
	_	_		what you learned	2	10	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	987/1342	3.18	3.68	4.07	4.05	3.75
		system clearl		-	2	2	0	3	4	1	4	3.50	1256/1459	3.80	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.50
8. How man	ny times v	was class canc	elled		2	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	1044/1480	4.75	4.63	4.68	4.68	4.50
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	274/1450	4.35	4.22	4.09	4.15	4.58
		Lectur	e.															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture		prepared	6	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	514/1409	4.70	4.44	4.42	4.47	4.70
		tor seem inter	_	_	6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	500/1407	4.84	4.82	4.69	4.78	4.90
				plained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	335/1399	4.68	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.70
		s contribute t			6	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	591/1400	4.31	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.50
				our understanding	6	4	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	590/1179	4.00	4.49	3.96	4.05	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discus			what you learned	7	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	810/1262	4.11	4.22	4.05	4.11	3.89
				d to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	643/1259	4.56	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.44
				d open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	636/1256	4.61	4.51	4.30	4.28	4.44
		chniques succe		a open arreassion	7	5	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	394/ 788		4.19	4.00	3.98	4.00
		Semina	1															
2 Wag th	e instruc		_	ividual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	Λ	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.68	4.53	4.83	****
		or grading mad		ividual accention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 68	****	4.89	3.92	3.55	****
				Freq	ienai	, Die	tri b	ıt i or	2									
				rieq	aency	DIS	CIID	uc101	1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3			Ту	pe 			Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 4														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ge:	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	ıh
				P 0			,				_		respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot.	her				1	.1						

Course-Section: ART 220 0101

Title ART HISTORY I Instructor: FELDMAN, JOAN

Enrollment: 120
Questionnaires: 64

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 79 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General				_										
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	3	10	22	26		1062/1481		4.41	4.29	4.40	4.02
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	7	18	34	4.27	811/1481		4.30	4.23	4.29	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	4	7	47	4.47	548/1249	4.47	4.32	4.27	4.36	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1 0	9 11	3 6	1 6	17 14	14 14	19 13		1138/1424 1130/1396		4.35	4.21 3.98	4.28 3.94	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	3	9	23	14	10		1130/1396		3.68	4.07	4.05	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	43 9	17	34	4.29	749/1459	4.29	4.02	4.07	4.05	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	1	3	58	4.86	770/1480	4.86	4.63	4.68	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	0	2	7	24	13	4.04	814/1450			4.09	4.15	4.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	4	16	40	4.56	705/1409	4.56	4.44	4.42	4.47	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	3	3	54	4.85	614/1407	4.85	4.82	4.69	4.78	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	8	15	37	4.43	659/1399	4.43	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	6	14	39	4.50	591/1400	4.50	4.35	4.27	4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	3	16	40	4.63	197/1179		4.49	3.96		4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	3	0	10	12	9	3.71	913/1262	3.71	4.22	4.05	4.11	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	4	1	7	10	12	3.74	1049/1259	3.74	4.50	4.29	4.34	3.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	3	0	10	7	14	3.85	1004/1256	3.85	4.51	4.30	4.28	3.85
4. Were special techniques successful	30	22	2	0	2	5	3	3.58	****/ 788	****	4.19	4.00	3.98	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	59	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.51	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	60	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	60	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	61	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.58	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	61	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.28	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	60	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 68	****	4.89	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	60	1	0	0	2	1	0		****/ 69	****	4.68	4.53	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	60	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 63	****	5.00	4.44	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	60	1	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.72	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	60	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 68	****	4.89	3.92	3.55	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	61	0	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.67	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	61	0	0	1	1	1	0		****/ 51	****	5.00	4.00	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	61	1	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.64	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	61	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 41	****	5.00	4.26	4.69	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	61	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.42	4.80	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	61	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 55	****	4.83	4.55	4.44	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	61	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	61 61	1 1	0	1	1 1	0 1	0	2.50	****/ 51 ****/ 34	****	5.00	4.65	4.66 4.43	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	61 61	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 24		5.00 5.00	4.83 4.82	5.00	****
3. Here there enough proctors for all the students	OΙ	4	J	U	1	U	U	5.00	/ 24		5.00	7.04	5.00	

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

Questionnaires: 64

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 79 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	1	A	34	Required for Majors	30	 Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	20						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	12	С	6	General	5	Under-grad	64	Non-major	12
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	.gnificant	
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 221 0101
Title ART HISTORY II

Instructor: ART HISTORY II
OTTESEN, BODIL

Enrollment: 104
Questionnaires: 103

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 80 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	56	0	0	4	9	19	15	3.96	1115/1481	3.96	4.41	4.29	4.40	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	56	0	2	9	8	15	13	3.60	1289/1481	3.60	4.30	4.23	4.29	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	56	0	1	9	6	17	14	3.72	1061/1249	3.72	4.32	4.27	4.36	3.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	56	6	1	4	10	16	10	3.73	1197/1424	3.73	4.35	4.21	4.28	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	56	1	0	3	6	18	19	4.15	594/1396		3.80	3.98	3.94	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	57	2	1	3	12	16	12	3.80	962/1342	3.80	3.68	4.07	4.05	3.80
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	57	1	1	9	9	7	19		1154/1459		4.02	4.16	4.17	3.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	56	1	0	0	1	1	44		491/1480		4.63	4.68	4.68	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	67	1	0	2	14	10	9	3.74	1107/1450	3.74	4.22	4.09	4.15	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	58	0	1	1	7	9	27	4.33	968/1409		4.44	4.42	4.47	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	58	0	0	0	2	10	33	4.69	941/1407		4.82	4.69	4.78	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	59	0	0	2	8	16	18	4.14	938/1399		4.40	4.26	4.29	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	2	7	12	23	4.27	852/1400		4.35	4.27	4.34	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	59	1	1	1	5	9	27	4.40	346/1179	4.40	4.49	3.96	4.05	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	67	0	8	7	6	6	9		1143/1262		4.22	4.05	4.11	3.03
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	67	0	10	5	7	7	7		1189/1259		4.50	4.29	4.34	2.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	67	0	6	2	7	8	13		1095/1256		4.51	4.30	4.28	3.56
4. Were special techniques successful	67	29	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	****/ 788	****	4.19	4.00	3.98	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	99	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.51	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	99	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	99	2	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 242		****	4.40	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	100	2	0	0	0	1	0		,		****	4.20	4.58	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	99	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.28	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	97	1	0	0	2	1	2		****/ 68		4.89	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	97	1	0	1	1	3	0		****/ 69		4.68	4.53	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	97	1	0	0	1	3	1		****/ 63		5.00	4.44	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	97	1	0	1	0 2	3	1		****/ 69		5.00	4.35	4.72	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	97	2	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 68	****	4.89	3.92	3.55	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	100	0	2	0	0	1	0		****/ 59		5.00	4.30	4.67	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	100	0	1	0	1	1	0		****/ 51		5.00	4.00	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	99	1	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 36		5.00	4.60	4.64	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	100	1	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 41		5.00	4.26	4.69	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	99	1	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.42	4.80	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	99	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 55		4.83	4.55	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	99	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 31		5.00	4.75	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	99	2	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 51		5.00	4.65	4.66	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	99	1	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 34		5.00	4.83	4.43	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	99	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	5.00	****

Course-Section: ART 221 0101
Title ART HISTORY II
Instructor: OTTESEN, BODIL
Enrollment: 104

Questionnaires: 103

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 80 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	22						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	11	General	6	Under-grad	103	Non-major	91
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Mean	s there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses t	o be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 305 0101 University of Maryland Title FILM I: MOVING IMAGES

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor: WORDEN, FRED Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 15

Page 81 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	395/1481	4.67	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	7	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	437/1424	4.50	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	2	1	2	6	4.09	649/1396	4.09	3.80	3.98	4.00	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	6	3	3.92	871/1342	3.92	3.68	4.07	4.12	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	775/1459	4.25	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.63	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	599/1450	4.29	4.22	4.09	4.10	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	878/1409	4.42	4.44	4.42	4.43	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	450/1407	4.92	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	567/1399	4.50	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	511/1400	4.58	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	134/1179	4.75	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	Λ	1	1	8	4.70	249/1262	4.70	4.22	4.05	4.14	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	422/1259	4.70	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	428/1256	4.70	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.19	4.00	4.07	4.00
**************************************	_	_			_	_	_							. • •

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	15	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	9	_			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ART 315 0101

VIDEO I

16

GRABILL, VIN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

Page 82 JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions						Fre	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 1															
1 Did voi	u dain ne	ew insights,ski	=	n this course	4	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	844/1481	4.25	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.25
		ctor make clear			4	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	822/1481	4.25	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.25
		estions reflect			4	0	0	2	1	4	5	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.00
	_	ations reflect		_	4	0	0	1	2	0	9	4.42		4.42	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.42
			-	what you learned	4	0	3	0	4	2	3		1239/1396	3.17	3.80	3.98	4.00	3.17
	_	_		what you learned	4	1	0	0	2	7	2		755/1342		3.68	4.07	4.12	4.00
		g system clearly		-	4	0	0	2	3	3	4		1154/1459	3.75	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.75
		was class cance			4	0	0	0	0	9	3		1215/1480		4.63	4.68	4.65	4.25
				ning effectiveness	4	0	1	0	2	6	3		1030/1450		4.22	4.09		3.83
		,		5														
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lectures	s well :	prepared	5	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	716/1409	4.55	4.44	4.42	4.43	4.55
	d the instructor seem interested in the subject as lecture material presented and explained clear					0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	705/1407	4.82	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.82
3. Was led	s lecture material presented and explained clear				5	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	523/1399	4.55	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.55
4. Did the	the lectures contribute to what you learned				5	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	852/1400	4.27	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.27
5. Did aud	id the lectures contribute to what you learned id audiovisual techniques enhance your understand				5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	147/1179	4.73	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.73
		_	_	_														
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contribu	ate to v	what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	617/1262	4.18	4.22	4.05	4.14	4.18
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	294/1259	4.82	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.82
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage i	fair and	d open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	486/1256	4.64	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.64
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		5	8	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 788	****	4.19	4.00	4.07	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 5														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	neral	l				4	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner					8						
				3 0														

Course-Section: ART 321 0101 University of Maryland Title 19TH CENTURY ART Instructor: SMALLS, JAMES

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 46

48

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 83 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

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

								eque.		~		-110	40001	CCALDO	. Dopo	CILDO		2200
Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean			
		Gener	 al															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	new insights,sk	ills fro	om this course	16	0	2	0	2	8	18	4.33	749/1481	4.33	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.33
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clea	r the ex	spected goals	16	0	1	0	7	12	10	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.00
3. Did th	ne exam q	questions refle	ct the e	expected goals	16	0	1	1	6	10	12	4.03	881/1249	4.03	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.03
4. Did ot	ther eval	uations reflec	t the ex	spected goals	17	3	0	3	7	10	6	3.73	1197/1424	3.73	4.35	4.21	4.27	3.73
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contri	oute to	what you learned	16	1	2	5	9	8	5	3.31	1176/1396	3.31	3.80	3.98	4.00	3.31
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments cont	ribute t	to what you learned	17	2	1	4	9	10	3	3.37	1174/1342	3.37	3.68	4.07	4.12	3.37
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clear	ly expla	ained	16	1	0	2	7	11	9	3.93	1021/1459	3.93	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.93
8. How ma	any times	was class can	celled		16	0	0	0	6	20	4	3.93	1398/1480	3.93	4.63	4.68	4.65	3.93
9. How wo	ould you	grade the over	all tead	ching effectiveness	20	1	1	1	3	14	6	3.92	945/1450	3.92	4.22	4.09	4.10	3.92
		Lectu	re															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lectur	es well	prepared	16	0	1	0	1	2	26	4.73	450/1409	4.73	4.44	4.42	4.43	4.73
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inte	rested i	n the subject	16	0	0	1	0	1	28	4.87	591/1407	4.87	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.87
3. Was le	Was lecture material presented and explained clear						1	0	5	9	15	4.23	846/1399	4.23	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.23
4. Did th	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						1					4.53			4.35	4.27	4.28	4.53
5. Did au	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					1	1	0	7	2	18	4.29	419/1179	4.29	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.29
		Discu	ssion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contri	oute to	what you learned	28	0	9	3	3	2	1	2.06	1244/1262	2.06	4.22	4.05	4.14	2.06
2. Were a	all stude	ents actively e	ncourage	ed to participate	29	0	5	3	2	4	3	2.82	1196/1259	2.82	4.50	4.29	4.34	2.82
				nd open discussion		0	3	1	7	4	3	3.17	1156/1256	3.17	4.51	4.30	4.34	3.17
4. Were s	special t	echniques succ	essful	-	28	15	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 788	****	4.19	4.00	4.07	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
				-	-													
Credits E	Earned 	Cum. GP	A 	Expected Grades				Re:	ason	.s 			Туј	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 14					Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	2	Graduate	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99		в 9														
						Ge	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 4	16	Non-	-major	21
84-150																		
Grad. $0 3.50-4.00 10 F 0$						El	ecti	ves				0	#### - I					յh
				P 0									response	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				Ι 0		Ot	her				2	8						
? 1																		

Course-Section: ART 323 0101 University of Max Title 20TH CENTURY ART Baltimore Cour Instructor: OTTESEN, BODIL Spring 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 45

45

University of Maryland Page 84
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

19

responses to be significant

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did v	ou gain ne	w insights,ski		m this course	20	0	0	2	6	8	9	3.96	1106/1481	4.25	4.41	4.29	4.29	3.96
		tor make clear			20	0	0	0	6	11	8	4.08	967/1481		4.30	4.23	4.23	4.08
		estions reflect			20	0	1	2	1	8	13	4.20	788/1249	4.37	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.20
	_	ations reflect		_	20	1	1	2	3	8	10	4.00	959/1424	4.33	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.00
				what you learned	23	0	2	2	5	5	8	3.68	972/1396	3.86	3.80	3.98	4.00	3.68
6. Did w	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	23	2	4	0	3	7	6	3.55	1093/1342	3.98	3.68	4.07	4.12	3.55
7. Was t	he grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	23	0	0	2	3	6	11	4.18	836/1459	4.53	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.18
8. How m	nany times	was class cance	elled		23	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1480	4.96	4.63	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How w	ould you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	23	0	0	0	3	14	5	4.09	786/1450	4.23	4.22	4.09	4.10	4.09
		Lecture																
		ctor's lecture:			21	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	290/1409		4.44	4.42	4.43	4.83
		tor seem inter			21	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1407		4.82	4.69	4.67	5.00
		_		xplained clearly	21	0	0	0	0	12	12	4.50	567/1399		4.40	4.26	4.27	4.50
		es contribute to		-	21	0	0	1	0	5	18	4.67	421/1400		4.35	4.27	4.28	4.67
5. Did a	udiovisual	. techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	21	0	1	0	0	4	19	4.67	177/1179	4.72	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.67
		- ·																
1 541		Discus			0.0	0	_	1	-	2	2	0 00	1170/1060	2 50	4 00	4 05	4 1 4	0 00
				what you learned	26 26	0	5 2	6	4	3 4	3		1178/1262 1162/1259		4.22	4.05 4.29	4.14	
		-	_	d to participate d open discussion	26 26	0	∠ 1	5	7	1	3		1162/1259		4.50 4.51		4.34	3.00
3. DIG C	ne mstruc	cor encourage .	Lair an	a open arscussion	20	U	1	5	/	Т	5	3.21	1149/1250	3.91	4.51	4.30	4.34	3.21
		Self 1	Paced															
1. Did s	self-paced			what you learned	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	4.83	4.55	4.88	****
	-	-		-														
				Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utior	ı									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A 9		Rec	 mir	ed fo	 or M	aior		1	 Graduat		0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 10)	-	_	014444	-	-		-	ŭ
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C 4		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad 4	15	Non-	-major	40
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D 0									5				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
				- ·														

Other

Ρ

I

?

0

0

Course-Section: ART 323 0201 University of Maryland Title 20TH CENTURY ART Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Instructor: JACOB, PREMINDA

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 24

Page 85 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course 1	Evaluation	Questionnaire
------------------	------------	---------------

Questions		NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	6	16	4.54	513/1481	4.25	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	324/1481	4.37	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	16	4.54	460/1249	4.37	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	287/1424	4.33	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	5	12	4.04	681/1396	3.86	3.80	3.98	4.00	4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	7	14	4.42	394/1342	3.98	3.68	4.07	4.12	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	119/1459	4.53	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	631/1480	4.96	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	8	11	4.36	515/1450	4.23	4.22	4.09	4.10	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	169/1409	4.88	4.44	4.42	4.43	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	250/1407	4.98	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	480/1399	4.54	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	218/1400	4.75	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	120/1179	4.72	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	4	2	11	4.28	556/1262		4.22	4.05	4.14	4.28
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	694/1259	3.69	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	506/1256	3.91	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.61
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	1	0	4	1	8	4.07	377/ 788	4.07	4.19	4.00	4.07	4.07
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.89	4.49	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.68	4.53	4.66	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	5.00	4.44	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.89	3.92	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.48	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.00	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.26	3.90	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.42	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.83	4.55	4.88	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.88	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	4.67	****

Course-Section: ART 323 0201 Title 20TH CENTURY ART Instructor:

JACOB, PREMINDA

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 24 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 85 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 325 0101

Title HIST OF FILM & VIDEO

Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN

Enrollment: 55
Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 86 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer		s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	28	0	1	3	5	10	7	3.73	1265/1481	3.73	4.41	4.29	4.29	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	28	0	1	4	8	10	3		1366/1481	3.38	4.30	4.23	4.23	3.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	28	0	1	0	9	8	8	3.85	1005/1249	3.85	4.32	4.27	4.28	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	28	21	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/1424	****	4.35	4.21	4.27	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	28	1	1	1	4	13	6	3.88	816/1396	3.88	3.80	3.98	4.00	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	28	24	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1342	****	3.68	4.07	4.12	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	28	0	1	1	2	11	11	4.15	863/1459	4.15	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	28	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	281/1480	4.96	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	33	0	0	2	4	12	3	3.76	1089/1450	3.76	4.22	4.09	4.10	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	28	0	0	0	2	9	15	4.50	762/1409	4.50	4.44	4.42	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	28	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	636/1407	4.85	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	0	0	5	9	11	4.24	846/1399	4.24	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	9	5	11	4.08	991/1400	4.08	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	28	0	0	0	0	6	20	4.77	129/1179	4.77	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	43	0	3	3	3	0	2	2.55	****/1262	****	4.22	4.05	4.14	***
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	42	0	6	2	2	1	1	2.08	****/1259	****	4.50	4.29	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	43	0	3	2	4	1	1	2.55	****/1256	****	4.51	4.30	4.34	***
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.89	4.49	4.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.48	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.00	4.13	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.33	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	4.83	4.55	4.88	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.88	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	ı									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	8	Under-grad	54	Non-major	31
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ART 331 0101

Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I

Instructor: IVY, JEANNE C.

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 15

Page 87 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	aner	cies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NΑ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
x														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	203/1481	4.72	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	219/1481	4.63	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	10	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.28	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	263/1424	4.70	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	11	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1396	****	3.80	3.98	4.00	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1318/1342	2.40	3.68	4.07	4.12	2.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	0	11	4.69	242/1459	4.40	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1480	4.56	4.63	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	334/1450	4.36	4.22	4.09	4.10	4.50
Lecture	2	0	_	^	^	_	1.0	4 02	000/1400	4 77	4 4 4	4 40	4 42	4 02
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	290/1409	4.77	4.44	4.42	4.43	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	659/1407	4.87	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2		4.83		4.72	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	312/1400	4.48	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	177/1179	4.63	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	146/1262	4.63	4.22	4.05	4.14	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	257/1259	4.83	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	256/1256	4.78	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	152/ 788			4.00	4.07	4.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 68	****	4.89	4.49	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 69	****	4.68	4.53	4.76	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 63	****	5.00	4.44	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 68	****	4.89	3.92	4.43	****
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	11	U	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	, 00		4.00	3.92	1.13	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.48	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.00	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.26	3.90	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.42	4.00	****
Self Paced						_	_	- 0-	, ==		4 05			
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 55	****	4.83	4.55	4.88	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.88	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 34	****	5.00	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	4.67	****

Course-Section: ART 331 0101
Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I
Instructor: IVY, JEANNE C.

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 87 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

University of Maryland Page 88
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ART 331 0201

11

GRAPHIC DESIGN I

BELL, KATHRYN L

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 10

					Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vou	ı gain ne	w insights,ski	_	this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	461/1481	4.72	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.60
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	517/1481	4.63	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.50
		estions reflect	_	_	0	9	0	0	0	0	1		****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.28	****
	_	ations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	263/1424	4.70	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.70
			_	hat you learned	1	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1396	****	3.80	3.98	4.00	****
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	1	6	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1340/1342	2.40	3.68	4.07	4.12	2.00
7. Was the	grading	system clearly	y explai	ned	1	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	899/1459	4.40	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.11
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1316/1480	4.56	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.11
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	662/1450	4.36	4.22	4.09	4.10	4.22
		Tash	_															
1 Word th	o inatro	Lecture actor's lectures		ropared	0	0	0	1	0	Ω	9	4.70	514/1409	4.77	4.44	4.42	4.43	4.70
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.70	500/1407	4.87	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.90
				_	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	459/1399	4.72	4.40	4.26	4.07	4.60
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				0	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	913/1400	4.48	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.20
	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	208/1179	4.63	4.49	3.96		4.60
5. Did auc	iiovisuai	. techniques em	lance yo	ur understanding	U	U	U	U	U	4	0	4.00	208/11/9	4.03	4.45	3.90	4.02	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ite to w	hat you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	437/1262	4.63	4.22	4.05	4.14	4.40
2. Were al	ll studen	its actively end	couraged	to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	304/1259	4.83	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.80
				open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	428/1256	4.78	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.70
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful		0	2	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	358/ 788	4.36	4.19	4.00	4.07	4.13
				Freq	iency	, Dist	ribu	utio	n									
				- 1														
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	}
00-27	0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7					Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 3			_			-								
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera	L				1	Under-g	rad 1	0	Non-	major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D 0									3				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives						0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh	
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner					9						
				? 0														

Baltimore County

University of Maryland Page 89 JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

8

responses to be significant

Enrollment:	18				
Questionnaires:	14	Student Co	ourse	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Ρ

I

?

0

0

1

Course-Section: ART 332 0101

GRAPHIC DESIGN II

WITKOWSKI, TRIS

Title

Instructor:

							Frequencies				Instructor		Course		UMBC Level		Sect	
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
1 544	General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course							1	1	2	0	1 10	600/1401	4 (5	1 11	4 20	4 20	1 10
		ew insights,skii ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	Τ		9 11	4.46	600/1481 286/1481	4.65 4.69	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.46 4.69
		lestions reflect		_	1	0	1	0	0	1	11	4.69	393/1249		4.30	4.23	4.23	4.69
	_	ations reflect			1	1	0	2	1	0	9	4.02	645/1424		4.32	4.27	4.20	4.02
				what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	2	9 6	3.92	791/1396		3.80	3.98	4.27	3.92
	_	_		what you learned to what you learned	2	4	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	542/1342		3.68	4.07	4.12	4.25
		_		-	2	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.25	196/1459		4.02	4.07	4.12	4.25
		g system clearly was class cance	_	arnea	2	0	0	0	1	3	8		196/1459		4.63	4.16	4.17	4.75
	-			ching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	0	3 1	o 7	4.56	296/1450		4.03	4.09		4.56
9. HOW WO	ouia you g	grade the overal	ı tead	ening effectiveness	5	U	U	Т	U	Т	/	4.50	290/1450	4.55	4.22	4.09	4.10	4.50
		Lecture																
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectures		prepared	1	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	514/1409	4.85	4.44	4.42	4.43	4.69
		ctor seem intere			1	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	804/1407	4.88	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.77
				explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	256/1399		4.40	4.26	4.27	4.77
		es contribute to			2	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	591/1400	4.48	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.50
				our understanding	1	0	2	0	1	2	8	4.08	566/1179	4.31	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.08
		1		3														
		Discuss	ion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contribu	ite to	what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	345/1262	4.42	4.22	4.05	4.14	4.50
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively end	ourage	ed to participate	2	0	1	1	0	1	9	4.33	729/1259	4.50	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.33
3. Did th	ne instruc	ctor encourage f	air ar	nd open discussion	3	0	2	0	0	1	8	4.18	815/1256	4.28	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.18
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	sful		3	5	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	85/ 788	4.92	4.19	4.00	4.07	4.83
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	ution	n									
				_	_													
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3			Type				Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	Graduate 0			r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Gei	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t		re not	enoug	ſh

Other

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2006

12

Page 90

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

16				
15	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

I

?

0

0

Course-Section: ART 332 0201

GRAPHIC DESIGN II

WITKOWSKI, TRIS

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires:

							Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course Dept		ept UMBC Level		Sect	
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
g1																		
1 Did 1101	n anin n	Genera ew insights,ski		m this source	2	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	203/1481	4.65	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.85
		ew insignes,ski ctor make clear			2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	286/1481	4.69	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.69
		uestions reflec			2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	298/1249	4.65	4.32	4.23	4.28	4.69
		uations reflect			2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	209/1424	4.55	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.77
				what you learned	3	2	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	959/1396	3.81	3.80	3.98	4.00	3.70
				o what you learned	3	8	1	1	0	1	1		1269/1342		3.68	4.07	4.12	3.00
		g system clearl			3	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	143/1459	4.79	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.83
		was class canc		illica	3	0	0	0	0	9	3		1215/1480	4.42	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.25
	-			hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	304/1450		4.22	4.09	4.10	4.55
J. 110W WO	ara you	grade the overa	II ccac	ming criceerveness	-	Ü	J	O	-	5	,	1.33	301/1130	1.55	1.22	1.05	1.10	1.55
		Lectur	е															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1409	4.85	4.44	4.42	4.43	5.00
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1407	4.88	4.82	4.69	4.67	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	445/1399	4.69	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.62
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	636/1400	4.48	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.46
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	1	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	238/1179	4.31	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.55
		Discus																
				what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	507/1262		4.22	4.05	4.14	4.33
				ed to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	451/1259	4.50	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.67
				d open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	698/1256	4.28	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.38
4. Were sp	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		6	3	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 788	4.92	4.19	4.00	4.07	5.00
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
	_																	
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту]	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduate	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	в 6														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	h
				P 0									response	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				_							_	_						

Other

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Title

Grad.

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

15

3.50-4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ART 333 0201 University of Maryland Page 91 GRAPHIC DESIGN III JUN 13, 2006 CAMPBELL, SUSAN Job IRBR3029

					NR	Frequencies				-		ructor	Course Dept					
Questions I						NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General																		
1. Did you	a gain ne	ew insights,skil	.ls fro	m this course	1	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	225/1481	4.82	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.82
_	_	ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	361/1481	4.68	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.64
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflect	the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	142/1249	4.77	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.91
4. Did oth	ner evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1424	4.86	4.35	4.21	4.27	5.00
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	649/1396	4.23	3.80	3.98	4.00	4.09
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contri	.bute t	o what you learned	1	8	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	474/1342	4.42	3.68	4.07	4.12	4.33
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	expla	ined	1	1	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	101/1459	4.70	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.90
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	9	2	0	3.18	1463/1480	3.45	4.63	4.68	4.65	3.18
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overal	l teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1055/1450	4.01	4.22	4.09	4.10	3.80
1. Were th	ne instru	actor's lectures	well	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	935/1409	4.50	4.44	4.42	4.43	4.36
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem intere	sted i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	997/1407	4.64	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.64
3. Was led	cture mat	terial presented	l and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	2	0	0	9	4.45	625/1399	4.64	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.45
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to	what	you learned	1	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	754/1400	4.59	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.36
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques enh	ance y	our understanding	2	8	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1179	4.25	4.49	3.96	4.02	****
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contribu	ite to	what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	810/1262	4.28	4.22	4.05	4.14	3.89
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively end	ourage	d to participate	3	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	643/1259	4.61	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.44
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage f	air ar	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	232/1256	4.78	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.89
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	sful		3	4	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	394/ 788	4.28	4.19	4.00	4.07	4.00
				Frequ	.ency	Dist	rib	ution	ı									
				_														
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades								Rea	asons	3			Туј	Гуре			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 9		Rec	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s	0	Graduate 0			Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1												_		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Ger	nera:	l				0	Under-g	rad 1	2	Non-	major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D 0														

Electives

Other

0

11

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

0

0

0

Ρ

I

Course-Section: ART 333 0301 GRAPHIC DESIGN III Baltimore County CAMPBELL, SUSAN

?

0

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 13

14

University of Maryland Page 92 JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Ctudant	('Ollred	F'772 1	iiation	Ouestion:	naira

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	nı gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	2	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	225/1481	4.82	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.82
		ctor make clear			2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	255/1481	4.68	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.73
		uestions reflec			2	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	369/1249	4.77	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.64
	_	uations reflect		_	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	240/1424	4.86	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.73
				what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	0	8	4.36	411/1396	4.23	3.80	3.98	4.00	4.36
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	2	5	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	303/1342	4.42	3.68	4.07	4.12	4.50
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	3	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	460/1459	4.70	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.50
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		2	0	0	0	4	6	1	3.73	1442/1480	3.45	4.63	4.68	4.65	3.73
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	662/1450	4.01	4.22	4.09	4.10	4.22
		T	_															
1 Maria b	h	Lectur uctor's lecture			2	0	0	0	1	2	0	1 (1	603/1409	4.50	4.44	4.42	4.43	1 (1
		ctor's lecture			2	0	0	0	0	2 4	8	4.64 4.64	997/1407	4.50	4.44	4.42	4.43	4.64 4.64
				xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	203/1399	4.64	4.62	4.09	4.07	4.82
		es contribute t			2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	239/1400	4.59	4.35	4.27	4.27	4.82
				our understanding	2	3	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	442/1179	4.25	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.25
5. Did au	laiovisua.	i tecimiques em	папсе у	our understanding	۷	3	Τ.	U	U	2	5	4.25	442/11/9	4.25	4.49	3.90	4.02	4.25
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	264/1262	4.28	4.22	4.05	4.14	4.67
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	336/1259	4.61	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.78
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	457/1256	4.78	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.67
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		4	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	164/ 788	4.28	4.19	4.00	4.07	4.56
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ıtioı	n									
Credits E	'armad	Cum. GPA		Errogted Credes				Do	2020				т.				Majawa	
	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades					asons				Ту]	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1				_	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her				1	0						

Course-Section: ART 334 0101 University of Maryland Page 93
Title GRAPHIC DESIGN IV Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Instructor: ABRAHAM, GUENET Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 10

O	estionnaires:	10	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

? 1

							Fr	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	918/1481	4.27	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.20
_	-	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	959/1481	4.22	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.10
		uestions reflec			0	8	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.28	****
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	807/1424	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.20
				what you learned	0	7	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	707/1396		3.80	3.98	4.00	4.00
	_			o what you learned	0	8	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1342	****	3.68	4.07	4.12	***
		g system clearl		_	0	1	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1063/1459	3.81	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.89
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	1324/1480	3.85	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.10
	-			hing effectiveness	3	0	1	0	1	1	4		836/1450		4.22	4.09	4.10	4.00
1 Wara ti	ho inatr	Lectur uctor's lecture		nronarod	2	0	0	0	2	2	3	1 11	1098/1409	3.76	4.44	4.42	4.43	4.14
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	568/1407	4.72	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.88
				xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	1	5		713/1399	3.94	4.40	4.26	4.07	4.38
		es contribute t		-	3	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	953/1400	3.93	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.14
				our understanding	3	2	0	0	0	1	4		111/1179	4.80	4.49	3.96	4.02	
J. Dia au	aiovibaa.	r cccimiques en	nance y	our unacrocanaring	5	2	Ü	O	O	_	-	1.00	111/11/2	1.00	1.15	3.50	1.02	1.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	236/1262	4.52	4.22	4.05	4.14	4.71
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	257/1259	4.71	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.86
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	532/1256	4.45	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.57
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		3	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	89/ 788	4.15	4.19	4.00	4.07	4.80
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Po:	asons	,			Ту	ne			Majors	
										- 			ту. 					,
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	\$	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 1		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot]	her					7						

Course-Section: ART 334 0201 University of Maryland Title GRAPHIC DESIGN IV

Questionnaires: 14

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 94

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: RE, PEGGY Enrollment: 14

			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	0	2	4	6	4.33	749/1481	4.27	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	736/1481	4.22	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	607/1424	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	10	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1396	4.00	3.80	3.98	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	1171/1459	3.81	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	5	4	1	3.60	1449/1480	3.85	4.63	4.68	4.65	3.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.22	4.09	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	1	1	4	1	3.38	1317/1409	3.76	4.44	4.42	4.43	3.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1069/1407	4.72	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	1237/1399	3.94	4.40	4.26	4.27	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1165/1400	3.93	4.35	4.27	4.28	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1179	4.80	4.49	3.96	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	507/1262	4.52	4.22	4.05	4.14	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	548/1259	4.71	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	723/1256		4.51	4.30	4.34	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	604/ 788	4.15	4.19	4.00	4.07	3.50

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	-			
				2	1						

Course-Section: ART 335 0101 University of Maryland Title GRAPHIC DESIGN V Baltimore County Instructor: RE, PEGGY Spring 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 37

38

niversity of Maryland Page 95
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

							Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 al															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,sk		om this course	7	0	0	4	6	7	13	3.97	1106/1481	3.97	4.41	4.29	4.29	3.97
		ctor make clea:			7	0	0	5	4	11	10		1142/1481	3.87	4.30	4.23	4.23	3.87
		uestions refle			7	0	3	3	4				1009/1249			4.27	4.28	3.83
	_	uations reflect			9	16	0	4	3	2			1316/1424		4.35	4.21	4.27	3.33
				what you learned	7	0	3	1	6	9	11	3.80	877/1396	3.80	3.80	3.98	4.00	3.80
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments cont:	ribute t	to what you learned	8	19	2	1	3	1	3	3.20	1220/1342	3.20	3.68	4.07	4.12	3.20
7. Was th	e grading	g system clear:	ly expla	ained	7	1	0	2	1	12	14	4.31	719/1459	4.31	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.31
8. How ma	ny times	was class can	celled		7	1	0	0	1	21	7	4.21	1253/1480	4.21	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.21
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the over	all tead	ching effectiveness	14	0	0	4	8	8	3	3.43	1253/1450	3.43	4.22	4.09	4.10	3.43
		Lectu	re															
1 Were t	he instr	actor's lectur		prepared	8	0	1	1	5	12	10	4 00	1152/1409	4 00	4.44	4 42	4.43	4.00
		ctor seem inte		1 1	8	0	1	1	4	8	15		1276/1407		4.82	4.69		4.21
				explained clearly	8	0	2	2	6	11	8		1174/1399		4.40	4.26	4.27	3.72
		es contribute			7	0	0	4	6	7	13		1045/1400		4.35	4.27	4.28	3.97
				our understanding	12	0	0	1	8	6	10	4.00	590/1179		4.49	3.96	4.02	4.00
		Discus	ssion															
1 Did al	ace dieci			what you learned	16	0	4	1	4	6	6	3 43	1026/1262	3.43	4.22	4.05	4.14	3.43
				ed to participate	16		2		5	3			1055/1259			4.29		3.71
		_	_	nd open discussion	16	0	0	3		4			984/1256					3.90
		echniques succ		a open arboabbien		14	0	0	4	3	-		****/ 788			4.00		****
				Frequ	ienas	, Die	trib	ut i oı	n									
				ricqu	aciic)	DIS	CLID	acio.	.1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 17		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 9						-						-		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 3	37	Non-	major	12
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
				Р 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her				2	28						

Course-Section: ART 341 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO ANIMATION Baltimore County Instructor: DYER, ERIC G Spring 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 14

14

University of Maryland Page 96
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Courge	Evaluation	Onestionn	aire

							Fr	equer	ncies	5		Inst	cructor	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 s	vou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	225/1481	4.64	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.82
		ctor make clear			3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	255/1481	4.48	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.73
		uestions reflec		_	3	9	0	0	1	0	1		****/1249		4.32	4.27	4.28	****
	_	uations reflect		_	3	2	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1424		4.35	4.21	4.27	5.00
				what you learned	3	0	5	0	2	3	1		1364/1396		3.80	3.98	4.00	2.55
	_	_		o what you learned	3	10	0	0	0	0	1		****/1342		3.68	4.07	4.12	****
		g system clearl			3	0	0	0	2	5	4		836/1459	4.05	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.18
		was class canc			3	0	0	0	0	0	11		1/1480		4.63	4.68	4.65	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	473/1450		4.22	4.09	4.10	4.40
J. 110	would you	grade one evera		ming clicociveness	-	Ü	ŭ	_	ŭ		ŭ	1.10	1737 1130	1.15		1.05	1.10	1.10
		Lectur	е															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	3	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	1074/1409	4.41	4.44	4.42	4.43	4.18
2. Did	the instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	880/1407	4.86	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.73
3. Was	lecture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	3	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	1096/1399	4.35	4.40	4.26	4.27	3.91
4. Did	the lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	3	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	988/1400	4.32	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.09
5. Did a	audiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	108/1179	4.86	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.82
		Discus																
				what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	631/1262		4.22	4.05	4.14	4.17
		_	_	ed to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	451/1259	4.76	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.67
				nd open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	723/1256		4.51	4.30		4.33
4. Were	special to	echniques succe	ssful		8	2	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	690/ 788	3.71	4.19	4.00	4.07	3.25
				_														
				Frequ	ıency	, Dis.	trib	utior	1									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	}
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 9		Re	guir	ed fo	or Ma	ior	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 2		110	-1			- ,	_	-	2_3000	-	-	- 100) 0	_	ŭ
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Gei	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	4	Non-	major	4
84-150		3.00-3.49	1	D 0									3				5	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
	-			P 0								-	respons				_	•
				I O		Ot.	her				1	.0			5			
				- -		- 0.					_	-						

Course-Section: ART 341 0201 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO ANIMATION Baltimore County Instructor: DYER, ERIC G

Spring 2006

Page 97

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	15			
Questionnaires:	15	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2 0 0 1 0 4 8 4.46 600/1481 4.64 4.41 4.29 4.29 4.46 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 2 0 1 0 1 4 7 4.23 843/1481 4.48 4.30 4.23 4.23 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 3 0 0 3 1 6 4.30 703/1249 4.30 4.32 4.27 4.28 4.30 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 3 0 0 0 3 9 4.75 217/1424 4.88 4.35 4.21 4.27 4.75 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 2 3 3 5 3.85 846/1396 3.20 3.80 3.98 4.00 3.85 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 10 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/1342 **** 3.68 4.07 4.12 **** 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 1 4 3 5 3.92 1030/1459 4.05 4.02 4.16 4.17 3.92 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 1 4 7 4.50 334/1450 4.45 4.22 4.09 4.10 4.50 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 1 4 7 4.50 334/1450 4.45 4.22 4.09 4.10 4.50
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2 0 0 1 0 4 8 4.46 600/1481 4.64 4.41 4.29 4.29 4.46 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 2 0 1 0 1 4 7 4.23 843/1481 4.48 4.30 4.23 4.23 4.23 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 3 0 0 3 1 6 4.30 703/1249 4.30 4.32 4.27 4.28 4.30 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 3 0 0 0 0 3 9 4.75 217/1424 4.88 4.35 4.21 4.27 4.75 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 2 3 3 5 3.85 846/1396 3.20 3.80 3.98 4.00 3.85 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 10 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/1342 **** 3.68 4.07 4.12 **** 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 1 4 3 5 3.92 1030/1459 4.05 4.02 4.16 4.17 3.92 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 3 9 4.75 880/1480 4.88 4.63 4.68 4.65 4.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 1 4 7 4.50 334/1450 4.45 4.22 4.09 4.10 4.50
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2 0 0 1 0 4 8 4.46 600/1481 4.64 4.41 4.29 4.29 4.46 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 2 0 1 0 1 4 7 4.23 843/1481 4.48 4.30 4.23 4.23 4.23 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 3 0 0 3 1 6 4.30 703/1249 4.30 4.32 4.27 4.28 4.30 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 3 0 0 0 0 3 9 4.75 217/1424 4.88 4.35 4.21 4.27 4.75 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 2 3 3 5 3.85 846/1396 3.20 3.80 3.98 4.00 3.85 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 10 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/1342 **** 3.68 4.07 4.12 **** 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 1 4 3 5 3.92 1030/1459 4.05 4.02 4.16 4.17 3.92 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 3 9 4.75 880/1480 4.88 4.63 4.68 4.65 4.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 1 4 7 4.50 334/1450 4.45 4.22 4.09 4.10 4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 2 0 1 0 1 4 7 4.23 843/1481 4.48 4.30 4.23 4.23 4.23 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 3 0 0 3 1 6 4.30 703/1249 4.30 4.32 4.27 4.28 4.30 4.30 4.32 4.27 4.28 4.30 4.30 4.32 4.27 4.28 4.30 4.30 4.32 4.27 4.28 4.30 4.30 4.32 4.27 4.28 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.32 4.27 4.28 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.32 4.27 4.28 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.32 4.27 4.28 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.32 4.27 4.28 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.32 4.27 4.28 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.32 4.27 4.28 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 3 0 0 3 1 6 4.30 703/1249 4.30 4.32 4.27 4.28 4.30 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 3 0 0 0 0 3 9 4.75 217/1424 4.88 4.35 4.21 4.27 4.75 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 2 3 3 5 3.85 846/1396 3.20 3.80 3.98 4.00 3.85 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 10 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/1342 **** 3.68 4.07 4.12 **** 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 1 4 3 5 3.92 1030/1459 4.05 4.02 4.16 4.17 3.92 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 3 9 4.75 880/1480 4.88 4.63 4.68 4.65 4.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 1 4 7 4.50 334/1450 4.45 4.22 4.09 4.10 4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 3 0 0 0 0 3 9 4.75 217/1424 4.88 4.35 4.21 4.27 4.75 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 2 3 3 5 3.85 846/1396 3.20 3.80 3.98 4.00 3.85 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 10 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/1342 **** 3.68 4.07 4.12 **** 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 1 4 3 5 3.92 1030/1459 4.05 4.02 4.16 4.17 3.92 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 3 9 4.75 880/1480 4.88 4.63 4.68 4.65 4.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 1 4 7 4.50 334/1450 4.45 4.22 4.09 4.10 4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 10 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/1342 **** 3.68 4.07 4.12 **** 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 1 4 3 5 3.92 1030/1459 4.05 4.02 4.16 4.17 3.92 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 3 9 4.75 880/1480 4.88 4.63 4.68 4.65 4.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 1 4 7 4.50 334/1450 4.45 4.22 4.09 4.10 4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 1 4 3 5 3.92 1030/1459 4.05 4.02 4.16 4.17 3.92 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 3 9 4.75 880/1480 4.88 4.63 4.68 4.65 4.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 1 4 7 4.50 334/1450 4.45 4.22 4.09 4.10 4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 1 4 3 5 3.92 1030/1459 4.05 4.02 4.16 4.17 3.92 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 3 9 4.75 880/1480 4.88 4.63 4.68 4.65 4.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 1 4 7 4.50 334/1450 4.45 4.22 4.09 4.10 4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 1 4 7 4.50 334/1450 4.45 4.22 4.09 4.10 4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 1 4 7 4.50 334/1450 4.45 4.22 4.09 4.10 4.50
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 1 2 8 4.64 603/1409 4.41 4.44 4.42 4.43 4.64
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 1 2 8 4.64 603/1409 4.41 4.44 4.42 4.43 4.64 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 0 11 5.00 1/1407 4.86 4.82 4.69 4.67 5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 1 3 7 4.55 551/1400 4.32 4.35 4.27 4.28 4.55 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0 0 0 0 1 10 4.91 88/1179 4.86 4.49 3.96 4.02 4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0 0 0 1 10 4.91 88/11/9 4.86 4.49 3.96 4.02 4.91
Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 418/1262 4.30 4.22 4.05 4.14 4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 257/1259 4.76 4.50 4.29 4.34 4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 406/1256 4.52 4.51 4.30 4.34 4.71
4. Were special techniques successful 8 1 0 1 1 0 4 4.17 335/788 3.71 4.19 4.00 4.07 4.17
Frequency Distribution
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 6 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 5
56-83 4 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 1 Under-grad 15 Non-major 7
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
P 0 responses to be significant
I 0 Other 11

0

Course-Section: ART 343 0101

Title HISTORY OF ANIMATION

Instructor: WORDEN, FRED

Enrollment: 59 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 98 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	3	3	10	27	4.42			4.41	4.29	4.29	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	10	12	20	4.19	892/1481	4.19	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	5	14	21	4.21	781/1249	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	25	1	0	4	3		4.17	840/1424		4.35	4.21	4.27	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	9	6		4.16	584/1396	4.16	3.80	3.98	4.00	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	30	1	0	4	1	7	4.00	755/1342	4.00	3.68	4.07	4.12	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	6	8	27	4.40			4.02	4.16	4.17	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	2	40	4.91	702/1480	4.91	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	0	1	2	17	10	4.20	692/1450	4.20	4.22	4.09	4.10	4.20
Lecture	4	0	0	1	1	7	2.1	4 70	F14/1400	4 70	1 11	4 40	1 12	4 70
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	7	31		514/1409	4.70	4.44	4.42	4.43	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1 1	0 2	4 11	35 27	4.82	682/1407 502/1399	4.82	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	7	6	26	4.34		4.56 4.34	4.40 4.35	$4.26 \\ 4.27$	4.27 4.28	4.56 4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5 6	0	1	0	3	2	32	4.68	167/1179	4.68	4.33	3.96	4.20	4.68
5. Did additivisual techniques enhance your understanding	O	U	Τ	U	3	2	34	4.00	10//11/9	4.00	4.49	3.90	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	3	3	5	4	9	3.54	980/1262	3.54	4.22	4.05	4.14	3.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	3	3	7	1	10		1094/1259	3.50	4.50	4.29	4.34	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	1	2	2	5	14	4.21	804/1256	4.21	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.21
4. Were special techniques successful	20	18	0	1	1	0	4		****/ 788	****	4.19	4.00	4.07	****
1. Note byestar sessing and basesbrar			Ü	_	_	ŭ	-		, , , , , ,		1.17	1.00	1.07	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	42	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	42	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.89	4.49	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	42	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.68	4.53	4.66	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	5.00	4.44	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.48	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.89	3.92	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.48	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.00	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	42	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	42	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.26	3.90	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	42	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.42	4.00	****
Calf Darad														
Self Paced	40	0	0	^	0	0	0	F 00	**** LL		4 02	4 55	4 00	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 55	****	4.83	4.55	4.88	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	42	0	0	-	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31 ****/ 51	****	5.00	4.75	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	42	0 1	0	0	0	0	2 1	5.00	****/ 51 ****/ 34	****	5.00	4.65	4.88	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	42 42	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24		5.00	4.83 4.82	4.67 4.67	****
J. Here there enough procedus for all the students	74	Τ.	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	/ 24		5.00	7.04	I.U/	

Course-Section: ART 343 0101

Title HISTORY OF ANIMATION

Instructor: WORDEN, FRED

Enrollment: 59
Questionnaires: 44

WORDEN, FRED

Baltimore County Spring 2006

University of Maryland

Page 98 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	23						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General		Under-grad	44	Non-major	9
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 347 0101 University of Maryla Title WRITING FOR FILM Baltimore County Instructor: COOK, CATHY Spring 2006

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 99

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	15		
Questionnaires:	14	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

					Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 1		Genera	_	. 1 .	•		•	0	0		_	4 60	205/1401	4 65	4 47	4 00	4 00	4 60
		w insights,ski			2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	395/1481		4.41	4.29	4.29	4.67
		tor make clear			2	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.50
		estions reflec			2	10	0	0	0	1	1		****/1249		4.32	4.27	4.28	****
		ations reflect	_		2	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	645/1424		4.35	4.21	4.27	4.33
	_	_		hat you learned	2	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	502/1396		3.80	3.98	4.00	4.25
		_		what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	303/1342		3.68	4.07	4.12	4.50
		system clearly		.ned	3	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	961/1459		4.02	4.16	4.17	4.00
	-	was class cance			3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	702/1480		4.63	4.68	4.65	4.91
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	259/1450	4.60	4.22	4.09	4.10	4.60
1 Mana bl	ha	Lectur			1	0	0	0	1	_	2	4 20	1068/1409	4 00	1 11	4 40	1 12	4 20
		ctor's lecture			4	0	0	0	0	6	3	5.00	,		4.44		4.43	4.20
		tor seem inter		_	4	0	-	-	-	0	10		1/1407	5.00		4.69	4.67	5.00
	as lecture material presented and explained clearly id the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	1	5	4		783/1399		4.40	4.26	4.27	4.30
	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					0	0	•	2	3	5	4.30	829/1400		4.35	4.27	4.28	4.30
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	nance yo	our understanding	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	108/1179	4.82	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.82
		Discus																
1 541				1	4	0	0	0	_	_	_	4 40	427/1060	4 40	4 00	4 05	1 1 1	4 40
				hat you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	437/1262		4.22	4.05	4.14	4.40
		-	_	l to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	451/1259		4.50	4.29	4.34	4.67
				l open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	296/1256		4.51	4.30	4.34	4.80
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssiul		4	3	2	0	1	3	1	3.14	705/ 788	3.14	4.19	4.00	4.07	3.14
				Freq	ionai	. Dia	+ v i h	1+101	n									
				ried	uency	DIS	CIID	ucio	.1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	 А б		Re	guir	ed f	or Ma	aior		1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo		0		
28-55	0		0.00-0.99 0 A 6 1.00-1.99 0 B 5				quil	- Cu -	J_ 110	. J O L	5	-	Gradade	_	Ü	11000	-	Ü
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		00.	c. a.	-				•	onaci g	1	-	1,011		3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		E1	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	ιh
orua.	Ü	3.30 1.00	3	P 0			2001					-	respons				_	,
				I O		O+1	her					8	I CDPOIID	-2 CO L	5191			
				? 1		OC.	TICI					U						
				; ±														

Course-Section: ART 350 0101 University of Maryland Title CONSTRUCTED ENVIRONMEN Baltimore County

Instructor: PEREGOY, CHRIST

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 8

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 100

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	652/1481	4.43	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	693/1481	4.38	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	1081/1249	3.67	4.32	4.27	4.28	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	533/1424	4.43	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	502/1396	4.25	3.80	3.98	4.00	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	749/1459	4.29	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1133/1480	4.38	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	184/1450	4.71	4.22	4.09	4.10	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	618/1409	4.63	4.44	4.42	4.43	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	568/1407	4.88	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	431/1399	4.63	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	312/1400	4.75	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	259/1179	4.50	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	Ο	0	2	4	Ο	3.67	931/1262	3.67	4.22	4.05	4.14	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.50	4.29	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	272/1256	4.83	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.19	4.00	4.07	4.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		Under-grad	8	Non-major	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	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	8				
				2	Ο						

Course-Section: ART 351 0101

Title BLACK & WHITE PHOTO

Instructor: Silberg, Steven

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 10

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 101 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	quer	cies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	3	3		1069/1481		4.41		4.29	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	950/1481	4.11	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1175/1424	3.78	4.35	4.21	4.27	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	2	2	3.67	985/1396	3.67	3.80	3.98	4.00	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1093/1342	3.56	3.68	4.07	4.12	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	1	3	3.56	1242/1459	3.56	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	951/1480	4.67	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	3	5	0	3.44	1249/1450	3.44	4.22	4.09	4.10	3.44
Lecture														
 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 	1	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.44	4.42	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	4		1268/1407	4.22	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.22
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1156/1399	3.78	4.40	4.26	4.27	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1183/1400	3.67	4.35	4.27	4.28	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	549/1179	4.11	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	1		810/1262	3.89	4.22	4.05	4.14	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	729/1259	4.33	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	636/1256	4.44	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	4	3	0	3.43	640/ 788	3.43	4.19	4.00	4.07	3.43
- 1														
Laboratory	•	0	•	0	0	-	-	4 50		****	****	4 00	4 00	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 246	****		4.20	4.20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0 1	0	2	0		****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	U	U	Τ	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 217	^^^		4.04	4.11	* * * *
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 68	****	4.89	4.49	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 69	****	4.68	4.53	4.66	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 63	****	5.00	4.44	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 68	****	4.89	3.92	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	פ	U	U	U	U	_	U	4.00	/ 08		4.03	3.94	4.43	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.48	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 51	****	5.00	4.00	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 41	****	5.00	4.26	3.90	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	-		****/ 31	****		4.42	4.00	****
J. Did conferences help you early out little detivities		Ü	Ü	O	O	O	_	3.00	, 31		3.00	1.12	1.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.83	4.55	4.88	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.88	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	4.67	****

Course-Section: ART 351 0101

Title BLACK & WHITE PHOTO

Instructor: Silberg, Steven

Enrollment: 12
Questionnaires: 10

Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 101 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

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

Course-Section: ART 352 0101 University of Maryland SEQUENCE AND TIME Baltimore County CAZABON, LYNN

Spring 2006

Page 102

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	11				
Questionnaires:	10	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Title

Instructor:

	Questions					NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General	L															
		w insights,skil			1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	505/1481		4.41	4.29	4.29	4.56
2. Did the	e instruc	tor make clear	the exp	pected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	128/1481	4.89	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.89
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the e	xpected goals	1	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.28	****
		ations reflect			1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	287/1424	4.67	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.67
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	633/1396		3.80	3.98	4.00	4.11
				o what you learned	1	2	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1011/1342	3.71	3.68	4.07	4.12	3.71
		system clearly		ined	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	402/1459		4.02	4.16	4.17	4.56
		was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	729/1480		4.63	4.68	4.65	4.89
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overal	ll teac	ning effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	259/1450	4.60	4.22	4.09	4.10	4.60
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures	well	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	618/1409	4.63	4.44	4.42	4.43	4.63
2. Did the	old the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.67	5.00
3. Was le	Was lecture material presented and explained clearl						0	0	0	1	7	4.88	153/1399	4.88	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.88
4. Did the	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	468/1400	4.63	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.63
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	94/1179	4.88	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.88
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contribu	ite to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	310/1262	4.57	4.22	4.05	4.14	4.57
				d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	7		1/1259	5.00	4.50	4.29	4.34	
		_	_	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	7		1/1256		4.51	4.30	4.34	
		chniques succes			3	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	278/ 788		4.19	4.00	4.07	
				Frequ	ona	. Dia	t wib	ıtior	^									
				riequ	iency	DIS	CLID	10101	.1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7						quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	 3	2	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55																		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives							1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0							respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt			
				I 0	Other					6								
				? 1														

Course-Section: ART 353 0101 COLOR PHOTOGRAPHY PEREGOY, CHRIST

I 0

? 0

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

17

University of Maryland Page 103 Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

						Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
			Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			Genera	 l															
1. D	id vou	gain ne	w insights,ski		m this course	8	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	173/1481	4.89	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.89
			tor make clear			8	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	128/1481	4.89	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.89
3. D	id the	exam qu	estions reflect	the e	xpected goals	8	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	846/1249	4.11	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.11
4. D	id othe	er evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	8	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	287/1424	4.67	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.67
5. D	id assi	gned re	adings contrib	ate to	what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	193/1396	4.67	3.80	3.98	4.00	4.67
6. D	id writ	ten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	8	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1342	****	3.68	4.07	4.12	***
7. W	as the	grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	8	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	695/1459	4.33	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.33
8. H	ow many	times	was class cance	elled		8	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	863/1480	4.78	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.78
9. H	ow woul	.d you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	12	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1450	****	4.22	4.09	4.10	****
			Lecture	<u> </u>															
1. W	ere the	e the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	2	2	5	4.33	968/1409	4.33	4.44	4.42	4.43	4.33
2. D	id the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	545/1407	4.89	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.89
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearl						0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	376/1399	4.67	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.67
4. D	id the	lecture	s contribute to	what	you learned	8	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	421/1400	4.67	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.67
5. D	id audi	ovisual	techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	8	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	233/1179	4.56	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.56
			Discus	sion															
1. D	id clas	s discu	ssions contrib	ite to	what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	467/1262	4.38	4.22	4.05	4.14	4.38
2. W	ere all	studen	ts actively end	courage	d to participate	9	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	489/1259	4.63	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.63
3. D	id the	instruc	tor encourage :	fair an	d open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	496/1256	4.63	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.63
4. W	ere spe	cial te	chniques succes	ssful	-	9	3	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	152/ 788	4.60	4.19	4.00	4.07	4.60
					Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	1									
a 1	=	,	Cum. GPA						_					_					
Cred	its Ear	Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3 			Ту	pe 			Majors	; 			
00-		0	0.00-0.99	0	А б		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors		0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-		0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-		1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	major	13
84-		6	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Gra	d.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0 P 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - respons				_	ŗh

Other

Course-Section: ART 370 0101

SILKSCREEN PRINTING

Title Instructor: CHAN, IRENE

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 15

Spring 2006

Page 104 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	eanei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	4 07	021/1401	4 07	4 41	4 00	4 00	4 07
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0 2	4	3 7	8	4.27	,		4.41	4.29	4.29	4.27 3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0		2			1			1216/1481		4.30	4.23	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals		6 1	1	0 1	3 2		3		1147/1249		4.32	4.27 4.21	4.28 4.27	3.33 3.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	1	5	6 2	4		1170/1424 1345/1396		4.35	3.98	4.27	2.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	5 5	3	1				3.68	4.07	4.12	2.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	4	2	3	3 4	1		1323/1342 1416/1459		4.02		4.12	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	_	_		491/1480		4.63	4.16 4.68	4.17	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	6	7			1354/1450		4.03	4.00	4.10	3.00
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	U	U	4	O	4	U	3.00	1334/1430	3.00	4.22	4.03	4.10	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	1	5	6	4.07	1131/1409	4.07	4.44	4.42	4.43	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	804/1407	4.77	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	3	3	4	3.75	1163/1399	3.75	4.40	4.26	4.27	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	6	3	3	3.75	1145/1400	3.75	4.35	4.27	4.28	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	2	5	1	3	3.25	997/1179	3.25	4.49	3.96	4.02	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	5	5	1	3 42	1030/1262	3.42	4.22	4.05	4.14	3.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	670/1259		4.50	4.29	4.34	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	868/1256		4.51	4.30	4.34	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	1	0	2	1	0		742/ 788		4.19		4.07	
i. Neie bpecial cecimiques successius	3	J	_	J	_	-	Ü	2.75	7127 700	2.75	1.17	1.00	1.07	2.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 68	****	4.89	4.49	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 69	****	4.68	4.53	4.66	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 63		5.00	4.44	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 69		5.00	4.35	4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 68		4.89	3.92	4.43	****
									,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.48	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 51	****	5.00	4.00	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 36		5.00	4.60	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 41	****	5.00	4.26	3.90	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.42	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.83	4.55	4.88	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	5.00	4.65	4.88	****
Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14 14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24	****	5.00		4.67	****
The state of the s		-	-	-	-	-	_		, 21					

Course-Section: ART 370 0101

Title SILKSCREEN PRINTING

Instructor: CHAN, IRENE

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 104 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	11	Under-grad	15	Non-major	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ART 375 0101 University of Maryland Page 105 Title PHOTO/DIG PROC IN PRIN JUN 13, 2006

Baltimore County JEON, DIANA N Spring 2006

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 14

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

					-			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 al															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	ills fro	om this course	1	0	0	2	4	5	2	3.54	1347/1481	3.54	4.41	4.29	4.29	3.54
2. Did th	he instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	3	0	1	1	6	3	0	3.00	1420/1481	3.00	4.30	4.23	4.23	3.00
3. Did th	he exam qu	uestions reflec	ct the	expected goals	2	10	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.28	***
4. Did ot	ther evalu	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	2	0	0	3	4	3	2	3.33	1316/1424	3.33	4.35	4.21	4.27	3.33
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	oute to	what you learned	3	3	4	1	1	2	0	2.13	1389/1396	2.13	3.80	3.98	4.00	2.13
6. Did w	ritten ass	signments contr	ribute 1	to what you learned	l 4	0	5	0	3	2	0	2.20	1337/1342	2.20	3.68	4.07	4.12	2.20
7. Was th	he grading	g system clearl	ly expla	ained	2	0	2	1	2	7	0	3.17	1356/1459	3.17	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.17
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	celled		2	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1107/1480	4.42	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.42
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	all tead	ching effectiveness	7	0	1	0	6	0	0	2.71	1413/1450	2.71	4.22	4.09	4.10	2.71
		Lectur	re															
1. Were t	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	7	3	0	3.30	1332/1409	3.30	4.44	4.42	4.43	3.30
2. Did th	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	3	7	4.70	930/1407	4.70	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.70
				explained clearly	4	0	0	1	4	5	0	3.40	1260/1399	3.40	4.40	4.26	4.27	3.40
4. Did th	he lecture	es contribute t	to what	you learned	4	0	2	2	5	0	1	2.60	1356/1400	2.60	4.35	4.27	4.28	2.60
5. Did au	udiovisual	l techniques er	nhance y	your understanding	4	4	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	1095/1179	2.83	4.49	3.96	4.02	2.83
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrik	oute to	what you learned	6	0	1	0	5	2	0	3.00	1146/1262	3.00	4.22	4.05	4.14	3.00
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively er	ncourage	ed to participate	6	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.00
3. Did th	he instru	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	6	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	901/1256	4.00	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.00
4. Were s	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion Were special techniques successful					7	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 788	****	4.19	4.00	4.07	****
			Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits I	Farned	Cum. GPA	7	Expected Grades				Re:	asons	2			Ту	ne			Majors	•
	Impeded Glade									- 								
00-27						Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	5	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В б														
56-83	3	2 00-2 99	Λ	C 0	C 0							6	IInder-a	rad 1	4	Non-	-maior	3

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	14	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				2	Λ						

University of Maryland Page 106
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

?

0

Course-Section: ART 382 0101

15

INTERACTIVITY

THWING, JENNIE

Title

Instructor:
Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 14

							Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	2	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	478/1481	4.58	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.58
		ctor make clear			2	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.50
		uestions reflec			2	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.28	****
	_	uations reflect		_	2	1	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	607/1424	4.36	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.36
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	0	8	4.17	584/1396	4.17	3.80	3.98	4.00	4.17
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	2	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	3.68	4.07	4.12	****
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	2	2	1	1	3	2	3	3.50	1256/1459	3.50	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.50
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		2	0	0	0	0	10	2	4.17	1281/1480	4.17	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.17
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	7	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.22	4.09	4.10	4.00
	Lecture																	
1. Were t	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	1	0	2	9	4.58	670/1409	4.58	4.44	4.42	4.43	4.58
	id the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	1107/1407	4.50	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.50
3. Was le	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	567/1399	4.50	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.50
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	591/1400	4.50	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.50
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	259/1179	4.50	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	6	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	816/1262	3.88	4.22	4.05	4.14	3.88
				d to participate	5	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	729/1259	4.33	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.33
				d open discussion	5	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	791/1256		4.51	4.30	4.34	4.22
		echniques succe			5	6	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 788		4.19	4.00	4.07	****
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
				-														
Credits E	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 10					Red	quir	ed fo	or M	ajors		0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55				В 2														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				6	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	-major	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.						Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	ŗh
	P 0						her						respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
	I 0											5						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Course-Section: ART 384 0101 Title COMPUTER ANIMATION McIntyre, Frank Instructor: Enrollment: 15

Page 107 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Ο	uestionnaires:	12	St.udent.	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

	1					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	Ω	Λ	Λ	Λ	1	10	4.91	159/1481	4.91	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	176/1481		4.30	4.23	4.23	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	0	1		****/1249		4.32	4.27	4.28	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	557/1424		4.35	4.21	4.27	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	564/1396		3.80	3.98	4.00	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	474/1342		3.68	4.07	4.12	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	836/1459	4.18	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	2	4.18	1267/1480	4.18	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	196/1450	4.70	4.22	4.09	4.10	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	319/1409		4.44		4.43	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	417/1399		4.40	4.26	4.27	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	146/1400		4.35	4.27	4.28	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	404/1179	4.30	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	Ο	2	1	4	4.29	550/1262	4.29	4.22	4.05	4.14	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	402/1259		4.50	4.29	4.34	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	256/1256		4.51	4.30		4.86
5. 214 one instruction enough that the open discussion	3	J	3	3	3	_	J	1.00	250, 1250	2.00	1.31	1.50	1.51	1.00
_														

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	12	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there a	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	8	_			
				2	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Page 108 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	16	
Questionnaires:	16	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ART 385 0101

DIGITAL MONTAGE

THOMPSON, CALLA

Title

Instructor:

						-					tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
			Question	s		NF	R NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			 Genera	 1															
1.	Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	4	. 0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	143/1481	4.92	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.92
2.	Did th	ne instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	103/1481	4.92	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.92
3. 1	Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	t the	expected goals	4	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.28	5.00
4.	Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	122/1424	4.92	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.92
5.	Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learne	d 4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	193/1396	4.67	3.80	3.98	4.00	4.67
6. 1	Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute 1	o what you lear	ned 4	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	303/1342	4.50	3.68	4.07	4.12	4.50
7.	Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	4	. 0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	595/1459	4.42	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.42
8.	How ma	any times	was class cand	elled		4	. 0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1006/1480	4.58	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.58
9. 1	How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiven	ess 7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	154/1450	4.78	4.22	4.09	4.10	4.78
	Lecture																		
1. 1	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.44	4.42	4.43	5.00
2.	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.67	5.00
3. 1	Was le	ecture mat	terial presente	d and	explained clearl	у 4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.27	5.00
4.	Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned		0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.35	4.27	4.28	5.00
5.	Did au	udiovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understandi	ng 4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	104/1179	4.83	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.83
			Discus	sion															
1.	Did cl	lass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learne	d 8	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.22	4.05	4.14	5.00
2. 1	Were a	all studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participat	e 7	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	229/1259	4.89	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.89
3. 1	Did th	ne instruc	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussi	on 8	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.34	5.00
4.	 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion Were special techniques successful 					8	3 4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.19	4.00	4.07	5.00
	Fr							strib	utio:	n									
C mar	di+a T	Zownod	Cum. GPA		Errogted Cro	dod			Do	0000	-			TT				Mojewa	
	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades									ason:	5 			Ту				Majors	; . – – – –
	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 1 A 8						R	equir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 4																		
56	-83							enera	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	.6	Non-	major	9

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	8	Required for Majors	1	 Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	9
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0	Electives		responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ART 388 0101 University of Maryland Title ART ON THE INTERNET Baltimore County Instructor: HOWELL, BRENDAN Spring 2006

Enrollment:

12

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Page 109

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires:	12	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

I

?

0

0

					-					Inst	structor Cour		Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	Questions				NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	3	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	626/1481	4.44	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.44
		ctor make clear			3	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	950/1481	4.11	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.11
		uestions reflec			3	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.28	***
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	3	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.33
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	2	2	2	2	0	1	2.43	1374/1396	2.43	3.80	3.98	4.00	2.43
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	3	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	3.68	4.07	4.12	***
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	3	0	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	1142/1459	3.78	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.78
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		3	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1316/1480	4.11	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.11
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1098/1450	3.75	4.22	4.09	4.10	3.75
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	3	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1222/1409	3.89	4.44	4.42	4.43	3.89
		ctor seem inter			3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	963/1407	4.67	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.67
				explained clearly	3	0	0	0	5	3	1	3.56	1227/1399	3.56	4.40	4.26	4.27	3.56
		es contribute t			3	0	0	1	3	0	5	4.00	1017/1400	4.00	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.00
5. Did au	audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				3	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	233/1179	4.56	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.56
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	842/1262	3.83	4.22	4.05	4.14	3.83
				ed to participate	6	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.00
				d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	272/1256	4.83	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.83
		echniques succe			6	5	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 788		4.19	4.00	4.07	****
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Guadita B		G GDA		Towns at a d day do	uency Distribution												M	
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	Reasons				3 			Ту]	pe 			Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors		2	Graduat	е	1	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nera	l				4	Under-g	rad 1	1	Non-	-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F 0 P 0	Electives					0	#### - 1 respons		_	rh				

Other

Course-Section: ART 389 0101 University of Maryland Title TOPICS IN COMPUTER ART

Baltimore County Instructor: DYER, ERIC G (Instr. A) Spring 2006

Enrollment: 12

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

6

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

Questionnaires: 11 Student Course Evaluation Questionna	Ouestionnaires:	11	Student Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnair
---	-----------------	----	----------------	------------	--------------

					-						Inst	structor Course Dept			UMBC	Sect		
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 L															
1. Did v	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	2	1	2	6	4.09	1012/1481	4.09	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.09
_		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	5	4	1	3.45	1342/1481	3.45	4.30	4.23	4.23	3.45
3. Did t	the exam qu	uestions reflect	the e	expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.28	****
4. Did c	ther evalu	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	3	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1186/1424	3.75	4.35	4.21	4.27	3.75
5. Did a	assigned re	eadings contrib	ite to	what you learned	0	9	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1396	****	3.80	3.98	4.00	****
6. Did w	vritten ass	signments contr	ibute 1	to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	3.68	4.07	4.12	****
7. Was t	the grading	g system clearly	expla	ained	0	5	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1380/1459	3.00	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.00
8. How m	many times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	974/1480	4.64	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.64
9. How w	vould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1081/1450	3.76	4.22	4.09	4.10	3.76
		Lecture	2															
1. Were	the instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	2	4	2	1	3.22	1341/1409	3.22	4.44	4.42	4.43	3.22
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	4	5		1069/1407	4.56	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.56
				explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1227/1399	3.56	4.40	4.26	4.27	3.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	2	3	2	2	3.44	1245/1400	3.44	4.35	4.27	4.28	3.44
5. Did a	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	442/1179	4.25	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.25
		Discus	sion															
1. Did o	class disc			what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	437/1262	4.40	4.22	4.05	4.14	4.40
				ed to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	680/1259	4.40	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.40
				nd open discussion	6	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	901/1256	4.00	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.00
4. Were	special to	echniques succes	ssful	-	6	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.19	4.00	4.07	4.00
	Fre						trib	utior	ı									
	1																	
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors		1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r •	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 3														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 1	1	Non-	major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														

Electives

Other

2

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Page 110

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: ART 389 0101 University of Maryland Title TOPICS IN COMPUTER ART

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 111

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

DYER, ERIC G (Instr. B) Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 11

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					±					Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	- lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	2	1	2	6	4.09	1012/1481	4.09	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.09
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	5	4	1	3.45	1342/1481	3.45	4.30	4.23	4.23	3.45
		uestions reflec		_	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.28	****
4. Did of	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	3	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1186/1424	3.75	4.35	4.21	4.27	3.75
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	9	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1396	****	3.80	3.98	4.00	****
6. Did w	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	3.68	4.07	4.12	****
7. Was th	he gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	5	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1380/1459	3.00	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.00
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	974/1480	4.64	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.64
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1098/1450	3.76	4.22	4.09	4.10	3.76
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1409	3.22	4.44	4.42	4.43	3.22
2. Did th	he instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1407	4.56	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.56
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1399	3.56	4.40	4.26	4.27	3.56
4. Did th	he lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1400	3.44	4.35	4.27	4.28	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1179	4.25	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.25
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	437/1262	4.40	4.22	4.05	4.14	4.40
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	680/1259	4.40	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.40
3. Did th	he instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	6	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	901/1256	4.00	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.00
4. Were	special t	echniques succe	ssful	-	6	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.19	4.00	4.07	4.00
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits 1	Expected Grades				Do		_			т.				Majaza				
	earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	des Reasons						Ту	pe 			Majors	; 		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 1				1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0			
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 3	-													
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General			2	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	major	3				
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		El	ecti	ves				2	#### - Means there are not end			_	jh	
				P 0						responses to be significant								
I 0 Other									7									

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Spring 2006

Course-Section: ART 423 0101 Title ART SINCE 1945 Instructor: JACOB, PREMINDA

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 13

16

	Page	112	
JUN	13,	2006	
Job	IRBI	R3029	

	1			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	0	1	11	4.69	362/1481	4.69	4.41	4.29	4.45	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	481/1481	4.54	4.30	4.23	4.32	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	548/1249	4.46	4.32	4.27	4.44	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	485/1424	4.46	4.35	4.21	4.35	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	594/1396	4.15	3.80	3.98	4.09	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	2	6	4.00	755/1342	4.00	3.68	4.07	4.21	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	635/1459	4.38	4.02	4.16	4.25	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.63	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	99/1450	4.90	4.22	4.09	4.28	4.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	913/1409	4.38	4.44	4.42	4.51	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	613/1399	4.46	4.40	4.26	4.36	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	729/1400	4.38	4.35	4.27	4.38	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	0	11	4.62	202/1179	4.62	4.49	3.96	4.07	4.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	345/1262	4.50	4.22	4.05	4.33	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	190/1259	4.92	4.50	4.29	4.57	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	527/1256	4.58	4.51	4.30	4.60	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	1	1	9	4.42	213/ 788	4.42	4.19	4.00	4.26	4.42
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	4.89	4.49	4.68	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	31/ 69	4.75	4.68	4.53	4.64	4.75
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 63	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.49	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.53	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	4.89	3.92	4.10	5.00

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

Course-Section: ART 424 0101 Title

CONTEMP ART, THEORY, CR

Instructor: SPITZ, ELLEN

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 5

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 113 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

				-	ncie				ructor	Course	_		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	1	3	4.75	292/1481	4.75	4.41	4.29	4.45	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.30	4.23	4.32	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.44	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	740/1424	4.25	4.35	4.21	4.35	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1396	5.00	3.80	3.98	4.09	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	135/1342	4.75	3.68	4.07	4.21	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.02	4.16	4.25	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1044/1480	4.50	4.63	4.68	4.74	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.22	4.09	4.28	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	559/1409	4.67	4.44	4.42	4.51	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	376/1399	4.67	4.40	4.26	4.36	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.35	4.27	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	442/1179	4.25	4.49	3.96	4.07	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.22	4.05	4.33	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.50	4.29	4.57	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	357/1256	4.75	4.51	4.30	4.60	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.19	4.00	4.26	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	42/ 68	4.67	4.89	4.49	4.68	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	36/ 69	4.50	4.68	4.53	4.64	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 63	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.49	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.53	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	25/ 68	4.67	4.89	3.92	4.10	4.67
Frequ	equency Distribution													
Credits Farned Cum CDA Expected Crades				Po:	acon	-			ጥኒክ	ne.			Majorg	

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

Course-Section: ART 428 0101

Title THEORY/PRAC ART MUSEUM

Instructor: JACOB, PREMINDA

Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Page 114 Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

|--|

	1			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	4	9	1 60	262/1401	1 (0	1 11	4 20	4 45	1 (0
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.69 4.77	362/1481 219/1481	4.69 4.77	4.41 4.30	4.29 4.23	4.45	4.69 4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.32	4.23	4.44	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	485/1424	4.46	4.35	4.21	4.35	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	169/1396	4.69	3.80	3.98	4.09	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	424/1342	4.38	3.68	4.07	4.21	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	425/1459	4.54	4.02	4.16	4.25	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	561/1480	4.92	4.63	4.68	4.74	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1450		4.22	4.09		5.00
or non-would fou grade one everall educating effectiveness	_	ŭ	ŭ	ŭ	Ū	Ů		5.00	1,1100	3.00		1.05	1.20	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	275/1409	4.85	4.44	4.42	4.51	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.92	117/1400	4.92	4.35	4.27	4.38	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	79/1179		4.49	3.96	4.07	4.92
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1														
Discussion														
. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	113/1262	4.92	4.22	4.05	4.33	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	451/1259	4.67	4.50	4.29	4.57	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	272/1256	4.83	4.51	4.30	4.60	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	133/ 788	4.67	4.19	4.00	4.26	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 68	****	4.89	4.49	4.68	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 69	****	4.68	4.53	4.64	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 63	****	5.00	4.44	4.49	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 68	****	4.89	3.92	4.10	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 51	****	5.00	4.00	4.56	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 36		5.00	4.60	4.91	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12 12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	5.00	4.26	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities		0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.42	4.83	***
_														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	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	13	-		_	
				2	0						

Course-Section: ART 430 0101 University of Maryland GRAPHIC DESIGN VI Title

Baltimore County

ABRAHAM, GUENET Spring 2006

Enrollment: 2.4 Ouestionnaires: 22

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 115

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 3 0 6 11 4.47 587/1481 4.47 4.41 4.29 4.45 4.47 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3 0 4 10 4.05 979/1481 4.05 4.30 4.23 4.32 4.05 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3 13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 3 1 1 0 1 1 3 3.83 1009/1249 3.83 4.32 4.27 4.44 3.83 2 3 10 4.00 959/1424 4.00 4.35 4.21 4.35 4.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 11 0 1 0 6 4.25 502/1396 4.25 3.80 3.98 4.09 4.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 1 1 9 3.67 1039/1342 3.67 3.68 4.07 4.21 3.67 2 3 3 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 2 1 5 3 6 3.59 1233/1459 3.59 4.02 4.16 4.25 3.59 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 1 7 11 4.53 1034/1480 4.53 4.63 4.68 4.74 4.53 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 1 0 1 5 6 4.42 459/1450 4.42 4.22 4.09 4.28 4.42 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 6 Ω 1 4 9 4.19 1074/1409 4.19 4.44 4.42 4.51 4.19 1 1 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 5 0 1 0 0 2 14 4.65 986/1407 4.65 4.82 4.69 4.79 4.65 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7 0 0 4 9 4.33 753/1399 4.33 4.40 4.26 4.36 4.33 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 0 1 3 10 4.40 704/1400 4.40 4.35 4.27 4.38 4.40 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 4 0 1 2 2 4 4.00 590/1179 4.00 4.49 3.96 4.07 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 Λ 5 3.83 842/1262 3.83 4.22 4.05 4.33 3.83 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 2 1 9 4.58 524/1259 4.58 4.50 4.29 4.57 4.58 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 1 3 1 7 4.17 826/1256 4.17 4.51 4.30 4.60 4.17 4. Were special techniques successful 10 1 1 1 2 3.80 ****/ 788 **** 4.19 4.00 4.26 **** Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information $21 \ 0 \ 0$ 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 249 **** **** 4.11 3.87 **** 0 3.00 ****/ 242 **** **** 4.40 4.45 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 21 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 240 **** **** 4.20 4.43 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 21 0 0 0 1 0 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 21 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 217 **** **** 4.04 3.86 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 20 0 0 2.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.89 4.49 4.68 **** 1 0 1 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 20 0 0 2.00 ****/ 69 **** 4.68 4.53 4.64 **** 63 **** 5.00 4.44 4.49 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 1 4.00 ****/ 69 **** 5.00 4.35 4.53 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 21 0 0 3.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.89 3.92 4.10 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 20 0 1 4.50 ****/ 59 **** 5.00 4.30 4.93 **** 0 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 20 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 51 **** 5.00 4.00 4.56 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 20 0 **** 5.00 4.60 4.91 **** 2 5.00 ****/ 36 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 1 4.50 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.26 4.72 **** 20 0 0 0 0 1 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 20 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.42 4.83 **** Self Paced 0 3.00 ****/ 55 **** 4.83 4.55 4.86 **** 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 3.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.75 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 20 0 0 0 Were your contacts with the instructor helpful
 Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful
 Were there enough proctors for all the students 20 0 0 0 3.00 ****/ 51 **** 5.00 4.65 4.71 **** 0 20 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 34 **** 5.00 4.83 5.00 **** 20 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 24 **** 5.00 4.82 5.00 ****

Course-Section: ART 430 0101

Title GRAPHIC DESIGN VI Instructor: ABRAHAM, GUENET

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 115 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 431 0101 University of Maryland Title GRAPHIC DESIGN VII

Baltimore County

IVY, JEANNE C. Instructor:

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 24

JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 116

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

					Fr	equei	ncies			Inst	tructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ran	ık	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	1																
1 Did won gair	General n new insights,skills fro	m this sourse	5	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	316/1	101	4.74	4.41	4.29	4.45	4.74
	tructor make clear the ex		5	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	201/1		4.79	4.30	4.23	4.32	4.79
	m questions reflect the ϵ		5	13	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	498/1		4.50	4.32	4.27	4.44	4.50
	valuations reflect the ex		5	0	1	0	0	5	13	4.53	416/1		4.53	4.35	4.21	4.35	4.53
	d readings contribute to		5	13	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	584/1		4.17	3.80	3.98	4.09	4.17
_	assignments contribute t	_	5	9	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	303/1		4.50	3.68	4.07	4.21	4.50
	ding system clearly expla	_	5	0	2	0	1	3	13	4.32	719/1		4.32	4.02	4.16	4.25	4.32
_	mes was class cancelled		5	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	936/1		4.68	4.63	4.68	4.74	4.68
-	ou grade the overall tead	ching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	69/1		4.94		4.09	4.28	4.94
	Lecture																
1 Wara the in	structor's lectures well	propared	8	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1 /1	409	5.00	4.44	4.42	4.51	5.00
	cructor seem interested i		8	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	350/1		4.94	4.82	4.69	4.79	4.94
	material presented and e	_	9	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	162/1		4.87	4.40	4.26	4.79	4.87
	tures contribute to what		8	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	177/1		4.88	4.35	4.27	4.38	4.88
	sual techniques enhance	-	8	2	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	99/1		4.86	4.49	3.96	4.07	
5. Dia audiovis	suar techniques enhance y	our understanding	0	4	U	U	U	۷	12	4.00	99/I	.179	4.00	4.49	3.90	4.07	4.00
	Discussion																
1. Did class d	iscussions contribute to	what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	146/1	262	4.86	4.22	4.05	4.33	4.86
2. Were all stu	udents actively encourage	ed to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	257/1	.259	4.86	4.50	4.29	4.57	4.86
3. Did the inst	tructor encourage fair ar	nd open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	173/1	256	4.93	4.51	4.30	4.60	4.93
4. Were special	l techniques successful		11	2	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/	788	5.00	4.19	4.00	4.26	5.00
	Seminar																
1. Were assigne	ed topics relevant to the	announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	68	****	4.89	4.49	4.68	***
2. Was the inst	tructor available for ind	dividual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	69	****	4.68	4.53	4.64	****
3. Did research	n projects contribute to	what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	63	****	5.00	4.44	4.49	***
4. Did presenta	ations contribute to what	you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	69	****	5.00	4.35	4.53	****
5. Were criter:	ia for grading made clear	•	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	68	****	4.89	3.92	4.10	***
	Field Work																
5. Did conferen	nces help you carry out f	ield activities	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	31	****	5.00	4.42	4.83	***
		Frequ	encv	Dist	trib	ut.ioi	า										
		_	2														
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons					Тур	pe 			Majors	
00-27 0	0.00-0.99 0	A 14		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Grad	luate	2	0	Majo	or	0
28-55 0	1.00-1.99 0	В 4															
56-83 0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Unde	er-gi	rad 2	24	Non-	-major	8
84-150 11 Grad. 0	3.00-3.49 4 3.50-4.00 10	D 0 F 0		. רקד	ecti					0	и и и и		loona +	homo -		- ono	.h
Grau. 0	3.50-4.00 10	P 0		FT6	=CLI	ves				U			Means t es to b				111
		I 0		O+1	ner				1	.7	resp	OIIS	a LU L	e sigi	ııııdı	10	
		? 1		001					1	. ,							

Course-Section: ART 440 0101 University of Maryland Title FLIM/VIDEO PROJECTS Baltimore County Instructor: WORDEN, FRED

Spring 2006

Page 117

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	15				
Questionnaires:	13	Student Co	ourse	Evaluation	Questionnaire

? 1

							Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions					NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	- lls fro	m this course	1	0	2	1	0	5	4	3.67	1299/1481	3.50	4.41	4.29	4.45	3.67
_	-	ctor make clear			1	0	1	0	1	6	4	4.00	1000/1481	4.08	4.30	4.23	4.32	4.00
		uestions reflec		_	1	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.44	****
	_	uations reflect		_	1	2	1	0	2	4	3		1160/1424	4.03	4.35	4.21	4.35	3.80
				what you learned	1	7	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	877/1396	3.03	3.80	3.98	4.09	3.80
	_			o what you learned	1	7	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	592/1342	3.52	3.68	4.07	4.21	4.20
		g system clearl		_	1	5	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	872/1459	4.07	4.02	4.16	4.25	4.14
		was class canc			2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1480		4.63	4.68	4.74	
	-			hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3		4.50	334/1450		4.22	4.09	4.28	4.50
J. 11011 110	ara you	grade 0110 0 v 0 r a		ning clicociveness		ŭ	Ü	Ü	_	3	Ü	1.50	331, 1130	1.25		1.05	1.20	1.50
		Lectur																
		uctor's lecture			3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	514/1409	4.43	4.44	4.42	4.51	
		ctor seem inter		3	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	500/1407	4.78	4.82	4.69	4.79	4.90
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	459/1399	4.22	4.40	4.26	4.36	4.60
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	4	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	791/1400	3.92	4.35	4.27	4.38	4.33
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	162/1179	4.60	4.49	3.96	4.07	4.70
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al	ace diec			what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	589/1262	4.03	4.22	4.05	4.33	4.22
				d to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	548/1259	4.03	4.50	4.29	4.57	4.56
				d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1256	4.83	4.51	4.30	4.60	5.00
		echniques succe		a open discussion	4	7	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 788			4.00	4.26	****
T. WEIE B	peciai c	ecimiques succe	ssiui		-	,	U	U	U	U	2	3.00	/ /00		4.19	1.00	1.20	
				Freq	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	В 3		_		-					3	, .	_			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ge:	nera	Τ				0	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	-major	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D 0								0			,			,
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0			EL	ecti [,]	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ın			
				P 0								_	respons	es to b	e sıgr	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot:	her				1	.0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ART 440 0201 Title FLIM/VIDEO PROJECTS Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN

			_	_	
Eni	collme	nt:	7		
_			_		

Questionnaires: 7

Page 118 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			_							_				
			Fre	equei		5			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	1	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	1407/1481	3.50	4.41	4.29	4.45	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	909/1481	4.08	4.30	4.23	4.32	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	740/1424	4.03	4.35	4.21	4.35	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	1383/1396	3.03	3.80	3.98	4.09	2.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	1	1		1313/1342		3.68	4.07	4.21	2.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	961/1459	4.07	4.02	4.16	4.25	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	797/1480		4.63	4.68	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	836/1450			4.09	4.28	
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1086/1409	4.43	4.44	4.42	4.51	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	963/1407	4.78	4.82	4.69	4.79	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1130/1399	4.22	4.40	4.26	4.36	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1230/1400	3.92	4.35	4.27	4.38	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	259/1179	4.60	4.49	3.96	4.07	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	1		842/1262		4.22	4.05	4.33	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	1094/1259		4.50	4.29	4.57	3.50
0		^	^	^	_	_		4 (0	455/1056	4 0 0	4 - 1	4 20	1 (0	4 (0

Frequency Distribution

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 457/1256 4.83 4.51 4.30 4.60 4.67

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

Course-Section: ART 447 0101 University of Maryland
Title 2D ANIMATION/COMPOSITI Baltimore County

Title 2D ANIMATION/COMPOSITI Baltimore Count Instructor: MALDONADA, JORG Spring 2006

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 119

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	665/1481	4.42	4.41	4.29	4.45	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	1	6	4.08	967/1481	4.08	4.30	4.23	4.32	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	0	2		****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	385/1424	4.56	4.35	4.21	4.35	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	3	1	4	3.60	1025/1396		3.80	3.98	4.09	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1342	****	3.68	4.07	4.21	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	854/1459	4.17	4.02	4.16	4.25	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1107/1480	4.42	4.63	4.68	4.74	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1081/1450	3.78	4.22	4.09	4.28	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	1	4	2	3 50	1293/1409	3.50	4.44	4.42	4.51	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3 -	6		1107/1407	4.50	4.82	4.69	4.79	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	3	0	3	3		1196/1399	3.67	4.40	4.26	4.36	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	0	7	4.30	829/1400	4.30	4.35	4.27	4.38	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	U	1	1	3	3.88	712/1179	3.88	4.49	3.96	4.07	3.88
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	U	U	U	4	_	3	3.00	/12/11/9	3.00	4.45	3.90	4.07	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	708/1262	4.00	4.22	4.05	4.33	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.50	4.29	4.57	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	296/1256	4.80	4.51	4.30	4.60	4.80
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	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 a	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sigr	nificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ART 457 0101 University of Maryland Title PHOTO SENIOR THESIS II Baltimore County Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA

Page 120 JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	12	
Questionnaires:	9	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
		Genera	 1															
1. Did	vou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	268/1481	4.78	4.41	4.29	4.45	4.78
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	210/1481	4.78	4.30	4.23	4.32	4.78
		uations reflect			0	1	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	437/1424	4.50	4.35	4.21	4.35	4.50
				what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	816/1396	3.89	3.80	3.98	4.09	3.89
	_	_		to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	2		1145/1342		3.68	4.07	4.21	3.44
		g system clearl		_	0	2	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.02	4.16	4.25	4.00
	_	was class canc		211100	0	0	0	0	0	6	3		1158/1480		4.63	4.68	4.74	4.33
	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness						0	0	0	4	4	4.50	334/1450		4.22	4.09	4.28	4.50
Lecture																		
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	559/1409	4.67	4.44	4.42	4.51	4.67
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.79	5.00
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	513/1399	4.56	4.40	4.26	4.36	4.56
		es contribute t			0	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	791/1400	4.33	4.35	4.27	4.38	4.33
				your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	590/1179	4.00	4.49	3.96	4.07	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1 Did	class disc			what you learned	1	0	0	Ο	0	2	6	4.75	205/1262	4.75	4.22	4.05	4.33	4.75
				ed to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.50	4.29	4.57	5.00
		_	_	nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1256		4.51	4.30	4.60	5.00
Freq						, Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade:								Re:	asons	:			Ty	ne			Majors	ı
										, -								
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 6						Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0 B 2																
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0						Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49																

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

Course-Section: ART 465 0101 University of Maryla Title INTERMEDIA STUDIO Baltimore County Instructor: CHAN, IRENE Spring 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

12

University of Maryland Page 121
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

C+11don+	Courac	Erraluation	Ouestionnaire
bludent	COULSE	Evaluation	Ouescronnarie

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions				NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	478/1481	4.58	4.41	4.29	4.45	4.58
2. Did th	e instruc	tor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	909/1481	4.17	4.30	4.23	4.32	4.17
3. Did th	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	740/1424	4.25	4.35	4.21	4.35	4.25
5. Did as	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	411/1396	4.36	3.80	3.98	4.09	4.36
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	o what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	2	2	3.18	1227/1342	3.18	3.68	4.07	4.21	3.18
7. Was th	7. Was the grading system clearly explained						0	0	3	5	3	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.02	4.16	4.25	4.00
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	702/1480	4.91	4.63	4.68	4.74	4.91
9. How wo	uld you s	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	473/1450	4.40	4.22	4.09	4.28	4.40
Lecture																		
1. Were t	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	0	2	7	4.78	383/1409	4.78	4.44	4.42	4.51	4.78
2. Did th	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was le	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	2	2	5	4.33	753/1399	4.33	4.40	4.26	4.36	4.33
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to	o what	you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	166/1400	4.89	4.35	4.27	4.38	4.89
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	nance y	our understanding	3	4	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	590/1179	4.00	4.49	3.96	4.07	4.00
		Discus	zion															
1 Did cl	ass discu			what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	391/1262	4.45	4.22	4.05	4.33	4.45
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	294/1259		4.50	4.29	4.57	
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	288/1256		4.51	4.30	4.60	4.82
		chniques succe		a open arroaddin	1	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	394/ 788		4.19	4.00	4.26	4.00
				Frequ	ıency	7 Dis	trib	utior	ı									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А б		Re	guir	ed fo	or Ma	ior	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55								\			-	-		-	-) ~		-
56-83						Ge:	nera	1				4	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	-major	1
84-150	84-150 5 3.00-3.49 3 D 0												3				-	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0						El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
P 0													respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
I 0						Ot:	her					8	_		_			
? 0																		

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

INTERNSHIP Instructor: RE, PEGGY Spring 2006 Enrollment: 2

Course-Section: ART 494 0115

Questionnaires: 2

Title

Page 122 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	quen	cies			Instru	ctor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

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	1	0	4.00	1069/1481	4.17	4.41	4.29	4.45	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals			0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.30	4.23	4.32	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.02	4.16	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.63	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	4.83	4.22	4.09	4.28	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	4.67	4.44	4.42	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	4.67	4.35	4.27	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.49	3.96	4.07	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.22	4.05	4.33	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.50	4.29	4.57	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.60	5.00

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

Course-Section: ART 494 0125 University of Maryland INTERNSHIP Baltimore County

Page 123 Title JUN 13, 2006 Instructor: PEREGOY, CHRIST Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 1

Questionnaires:	1	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Frequencies					Instructo:		r Course		UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1069/1481	4.17	4.41	4.29	4.45	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.30	4.23	4.32	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	5.00	3.80	3.98	4.09	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.63	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	4.83	4.22	4.09	4.28	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	4.67	4.44	4.42	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	4.67	4.35	4.27	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.49	3.96	4.07	5.00

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

Course-Section:ART 494 0130University of MarylandPage 124TitleINTERNSHIPBaltimore CountyJUN 13, 2006Instructor:CAZABON, LYNNSpring 2006Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 2
Questionnaires: 2
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

 Course-Section:
 ART 494 0142
 University of Maryland
 Page 125

 Title
 INTERNSHIP
 Baltimore County
 JUN 13, 2006

 Instructor:
 THOMPSON, CALLA
 Spring 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Frequencies

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment:	4			
Questionnaires:	2	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

							L L (eque.	TICTES	>		TIIS	LIUCLOI	Course	: Dept	UMBC	телет	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	.1															
l. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	549/1481	4.17	4.41	4.29	4.45	4.50
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.30	4.23	4.32	4.00
. Did ot	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.35	4.21	4.35	5.0
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.02	4.16	4.25	5.0
3. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.63	4.68	4.74	5.0
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	334/1450	4.83	4.22	4.09	4.28	4.50
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1152/1409	4.67	4.44	4.42	4.51	4.0
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.79	5.0
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.36	5.0
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1017/1400	4.67	4.35	4.27	4.38	4.0
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.49	3.96	4.07	5.0
Discussion																		
. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.22	4.05	4.33	5.0
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.50	4.29	4.57	5.0
		Field	Work															
1. Did fi	eld expe	rience contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 59	5.00	5.00	4.30	4.93	5.00
2. Did yo	u clearly	y understand yo	ur eval	uation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.56	5.0
		ctor available			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.91	5.0
4. To wha	t degree	could you disc	uss you	r evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	5.00	4.26	4.72	5.00
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.42	4.83	5.00
				Frequ	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	<u>.</u>	Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27		0 00-0 99		 λ 0					 or Ma			0	 Graduat		0	Majo		 0
28-55						Ke	quit (eu L	OT INC	JULE	>	U	Graduat	-	U	Ma JC) <u>T</u>	U
26-33 56-83				C 0		Go	nera	1				0	Under-9	rad	2	Non	-major	1
84-150					GE.	пета.	T				U	onder-9	ı au	4	11011-	ilia JUL		
84-150				p1.	ecti	700				1	#### -	Meane +	here -	re not	enous	rh		
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	U	P 1		ьI	CCLT.	veb				_	respons				_	111
				I 0		O+-	her					1	respons	CD LU L	e sign	ıııcal	16	
				? 1		UL.	TICT					_						
				t T														

Course-Section: ART 495 0124

Title INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH

Instructor: GARDNER, SYMMES

Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 126 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions				_	ncie	5 .	_		ructor	Course	_	UMBC		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	12	4.86	196/1481	4.77	4.41	4.29	4.45	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	149/1481	4.92	4.30	4.23	4.32	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	172/1249	4.86	4.32	4.27	4.44	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	287/1424	4.83	4.35	4.21	4.35	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	82/1396	4.95	3.80	3.98	4.09	4.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	354/1342	4.73	3.68	4.07	4.21	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	460/1459	4.75	4.02	4.16	4.25	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	561/1480	4.99	4.63	4.68	4.74	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	473/1450	4.88	4.22	4.09	4.28	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	670/1409	4.79	4.44	4.42	4.51	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	450/1407	4.98	4.82	4.69	4.79	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	267/1399	4.88	4.40	4.26	4.36	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	591/1400	4.83	4.35	4.27	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	1	0	0	6	4.13	541/1179	4.56	4.49	3.96	4.07	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.22	4.05	4.33	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	489/1259	4.81	4.50	4.29	4.57	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1256	4.94	4.51	4.30	4.60	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	117/ 788	4.86	4.19	4.00	4.26	4.71
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4 50	****/ 68	****	4.89	4 40	4.68	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 69	****	4.68	4.49	4.64	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 63		5.00	4.44	4.49	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 68	****	4.89	3.92	4.10	****
Field Work						_						4 00		
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	Ţ	0		****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 51	****	5.00	4.00	4.56	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 36 ****/ 41	****	5.00	4.60	4.91	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13 13	0	0	0	0 1	0	1	3.00	****/ 41 ****/ 31		5.00	4.26	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities			U	U	Т	U	U	3.00	/ 31	^ ^ *	5.00	4.42	4.83	* * * * *
Frequ	encv	Dist	rib	ıt.i.oı	n									

Credits Earned		ned Cum. GPA			d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	4
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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	-		-	
				2	0						

Course-Section:	ART 495 0129	University of Maryland	Page 127
Title	INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH	Baltimore County	JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:	CHAN, IRENE	Spring 2006	Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	1		
Questionnaires:	1	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	1	0	4.00	1069/1481	4.77	4.41	4.29	4.45	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	4.92	4.30	4.23	4.32	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	4.99	4.63	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	4.88	4.22	4.09	4.28	5.00
Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	4.98	4.82	4.69	4.79	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	4.83	4.35	4.27	4.38	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	44/ 55	4.67	4.83	4.55	4.86	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.71	5.00

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	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	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section	n: ART 495 0134	University of Maryland	Page 128
Title	INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH	Baltimore County	JUN 13, 2006
T	CHILD CHON TOTAL	Gi 2006	T-h TDDD2020

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029 Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN Spring 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

1

			Fre	Frequencies				Instr	uctor	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	1	5.00	1/1481	4.77	4.41	4.29	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	4.92	4.30	4.23	4.32	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	4.99	4.63	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	4.88	4.22	4.09	4.28	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	4.67	4.83	4.55	4.86	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.71	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	5.00	4.83	5.00	5.00

Credits Earned Cum.		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	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	i
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	Ω						

Course-Section:	ART 495 0143	University of Maryland	Page 129
Title	INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH	Baltimore County	JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:	THOMPSON, CALLA	Spring 2006	Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title	INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH	Baltimore County	JUN 13,
Instructor:	THOMPSON, CALLA	Spring 2006	Job IRBR
Enrollment:	2		

Questionnaires: 2

			Frequencies				Instructor			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	2	5.00	1/1481	4.77	4.41	4.29	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	4.92	4.30	4.23	4.32	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	4.95	3.80	3.98	4.09	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1480	4.99	4.63	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1450	4.88	4.22	4.09	4.28	5.00
Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	4.98	4.82	4.69	4.79	5.00

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

Course-Section: ART 495 0145

INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH

Title Instructor: WORDEN, FRED

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 130 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	- <u>-</u>			Inst	ructor	Course Dep		-		Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Geneva 1														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1481	4.77	4.41	4.29	4.45	5.00
. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course . Did the instructor make clear the expected goals		0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	228/1481	4.77	4.41	4.23	4.45	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1424		4.35	4.23	4.35	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342		3.68	4.07	4.21	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	4.75	4.02	4.16	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	<i>3</i>	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1480	4.75	4.63	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1450	4.88	4.22	4.09		5.00
7. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	U	U	U	U	U	U	4	3.00	1/1430	4.00	4.22	4.09	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	4.79	4.44	4.42	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	4.98	4.82	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	4.88	4.40	4.26	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	4.83	4.35	4.27	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	4.56	4.49	3.96	4.07	5.00
Discussion							_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.22	4.05	4.33	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1259	4.81	4.50	4.29	4.57	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	4.94	4.51	4.30	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 788	4.86	4.19	4.00	4.26	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	4.67	4.83	4.55	4.86	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.75	5.00	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.71	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	5.00	4.83	5.00	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.82	5.00	5.00
3 •														

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

Course-Section: ART 638 0120 TEACH PRACTICUM Baltimore County

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

CHAN, IRENE

1

University of Maryland Page 131 JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

						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 yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	- lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.41	4.29	4.28	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.30	4.23	4.11	5.00
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.35	4.21	4.16	5.00
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.63	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.22	4.09	3.96	4.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.44	4.42	4.36	5.00
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.73	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.16	5.00
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.35	4.27	4.17	5.00
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.49	3.96	3.81	5.00
	Discussion																	
1. Did cl	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.22	4.05	4.07	5.00
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.50	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.19	4.00	3.97	5.00
		Self	Paced															
1. Did se	lf-paced	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	4.83	4.55	4.38	5.00
2. Did st	udy quest	tions make clea	r the e	xpected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.95	5.00
3. Were y	our conta	acts with the i	nstruct	or helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.54	5.00
4. Was th	e feedba	ck/tutoring by	proctor	s helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	5.00	4.83	5.00	5.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	;			Ty	pe			Majors	\$
														- 	1			
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		ке	quir	ea I	or Ma	Jors	<i>i</i>	0	Graduat	е	1	Majo)r.	0
28-55 56-83				G 0		0		1				1	Under-q	~~d	0	More	mo i o	0
84-150				General 1 Unde:					onder-g.	Lau	U	MOI1-	-major	U				
Grad.				Eleghines					0 ####			Moona +	horo a	vo not	onom	rh.		
Grau.	1	3.30-4.00	_	P 0	Electives 0					<pre>0 #### - Means there are not end responses to be significant</pre>			_	111				
I O				O+1	her					0	respons	co LU L	e sigi	ııı.cal.	10			
				5 0		OL.	TICI					U						
? 0																		

Course-Section: ART 640 0101

IMAGING & DIGITAL STUD

Title

Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 132 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies		Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	233/1481	4.80	4.41	4.29	4.28	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	183/1481	4.80	4.30	4.23	4.11	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.24	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	178/1424	4.80	4.35	4.21	4.16	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	707/1396	4.00	3.80	3.98	4.00	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	112/1342	4.80	3.68	4.07	4.18	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.02	4.16	4.01	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.63	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	334/1450	4.50	4.22	4.09	3.96	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.44	4.42	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.16	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	250/1400	4.80	4.35	4.27	4.17	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	111/1179	4.80	4.49	3.96	3.81	4.80
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.22	4.05	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	304/1259	4.80	4.50	4.29	4.30	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.50	4.29	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.19	4.00		5.00
4. Were special techniques successial	U		U	U	U	U	4	5.00	1/ /00	3.00	4.13	4.00	3.91	3.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.93	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.27	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.15	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	3.73	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	4.89	4.49	4.23	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	29/ 69	4.80	4.68	4.53	4.46	4.80
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 63	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.44	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.16	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	4.89	3.92	3.71	5.00
5. Note directia for grading made crear	Ü	Ü	O	Ü	O	Ü	,	3.00	1, 00	3.00	1.05	3.72	3.71	3.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.01	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.00	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.26	4.27	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	***	5.00	4.42	4.58	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.83	4.55	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.95	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.54	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 34		5.00	4.83	5.00	****
1. Hab the recuback/ entoring by proceeds herpful	1	U	O	J	U	U	_	5.00	, 51		3.00	1.03	5.00	

Course-Section: ART 640 0101

Title IMAGING & DIGITAL STUD

Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN

Enrollment: 5
Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 132 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: ART 690 0123
Title IND. STUDIES
Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN
Enrollment: 1

Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 133 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Course-Section: ART 690 0143 Title IND. STUDIES DYER, ERIC G Instructor: 3

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 134 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre		cies				uctor	Course			Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

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

Course-Section: ART 690 0144 University of Maryland Page 135 Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 REINSEL, JOSEPH Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnair	^_

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

IND. STUDIES

6

Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1481 5.00 4.41 4.29 4.28 5 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1481 5.00 4.30 4.23 4.11 5 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1249 5.00 4.32 4.27 4.24 5 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.21 4.21 4.22 4.23 4.24 4.24 4.24 4.24 4.24 4.24
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1481 5.00 4.41 4.29 4.28 5 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1481 5.00 4.30 4.23 4.11 5 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1249 5.00 4.32 4.27 4.24 5 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5 1 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.21 4.21 4.22 4.23 4.24 4.24 4.24 4.24 4.24 4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1481 5.00 4.30 4.23 4.11 5 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1249 5.00 4.32 4.27 4.24 5 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1249 5.00 4.32 4.27 4.24 5 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1424 5.00 4.35 4.21 4.16 5
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1396 5.00 3.80 3.98 4.00 5
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1342 5.00 3.68 4.07 4.18 5
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1480 5.00 4.63 4.68 4.74 5
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness $$ 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 $$ 1/1450 5.00 4.22 4.09 3.96 5
Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1409 5.00 4.44 4.42 4.36 5
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 $1/1407$ 5.00 4.82 4.69 4.73 5
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 $1/1399$ 5.00 4.40 4.26 4.16 5
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1400 5.00 4.35 4.27 4.17 5
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1179 5.00 4.49 3.96 3.81 5
Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1262 5.00 4.22 4.05 4.07 5
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1259 5.00 4.50 4.29 4.30 5
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1256 5.00 4.51 4.30 4.33 5 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/788 5.00 4.19 4.00 3.97 5
4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/788 5.00 4.19 4.00 3.97 5
Self Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 55 5.00 4.83 4.55 4.38 5
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 31 5.00 5.00 4.75 4.95 5
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 51 5.00 5.00 4.65 4.54 5
Frequency Distribution
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 1 Major
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 1 Under-grad 0 Non-major
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
P 0 responses to be significant

Other

I 0

0

?

Course-Section: ART 690 0145
Title IND. STUDIES
Instructor: BOOT, LEE

1

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 136 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre		ncies				ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

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

Course-Section: ART 790 0140 University of Maryland Title IND. STUDIES Baltimore County Instructor: COOK, CATHY Spring 2006 Enrollment: 1

Questionnaires: 1

Page 137 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

	Frequencies					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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.41	4.29	4.28	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.30	4.23	4.11	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.35	4.21	4.16	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.02	4.16	4.01	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.63	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.22	4.09	3.96	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.44	4.42	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.16	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	4.83	4.55	4.38	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.54	5.00

Credits E	Carned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	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	0	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 792 0123 University of Maryland THESIS PREP. Title Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN Spring 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

1

Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 138

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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