

Course-Section: ART 210 0101
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
 Instructor: BRADLEY, STEPHE
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 63
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	549/1481	4.30	4.41	4.29	4.40	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1130/1481	3.94	4.30	4.23	4.29	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1160/1424	4.05	4.35	4.21	4.28	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	1063/1459	4.14	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	702/1480	4.80	4.63	4.68	4.68	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1081/1450	3.94	4.22	4.09	4.15	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	514/1409	4.70	4.44	4.42	4.47	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	930/1407	4.80	4.82	4.69	4.78	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	966/1399	4.40	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.10	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	913/1400	4.40	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	162/1179	4.75	4.49	3.96	4.05	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	610/1262	4.10	4.22	4.05	4.11	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	509/1259	4.61	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	742/1256	4.46	4.51	4.30	4.28	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	7	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 788	4.50	4.19	4.00	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 210 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
 Instructor: SHIFLET, NICOLE
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 64
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	1006/1481	4.30	4.41	4.29	4.40	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1000/1481	3.94	4.30	4.23	4.29	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	684/1424	4.05	4.35	4.21	4.28	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1167/1396	3.28	3.80	3.98	3.94	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	2	4	1	0	2.44	1329/1342	3.11	3.68	4.07	4.05	2.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	611/1459	4.14	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	928/1480	4.80	4.63	4.68	4.68	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	771/1450	3.94	4.22	4.09	4.15	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	514/1409	4.70	4.44	4.42	4.47	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	500/1407	4.80	4.82	4.69	4.78	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	335/1399	4.40	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	492/1400	4.40	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	111/1179	4.75	4.49	3.96	4.05	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	708/1262	4.10	4.22	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	489/1259	4.61	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	496/1256	4.46	4.51	4.30	4.28	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	176/ 788	4.50	4.19	4.00	3.98	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.63	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.58	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.89	3.92	3.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.00	4.07	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.26	4.69	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.42	4.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.83	4.55	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.66	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 65
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	395/1481	4.52	4.41	4.29	4.40	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	909/1481	4.25	4.30	4.23	4.29	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	611/1249	4.42	4.32	4.27	4.36	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	217/1424	4.50	4.35	4.21	4.28	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	5	3	3.75	918/1396	3.56	3.80	3.98	3.94	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	5	5	2	3.75	987/1342	3.61	3.68	4.07	4.05	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	3	2	5	3.83	1101/1459	4.00	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	9	2	4.08	1329/1480	4.51	4.63	4.68	4.68	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	546/1450	4.07	4.22	4.09	4.15	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 the instructor seem interested in 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 lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	1	7	4.17	910/1399	4.27	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	384/1179	4.43	4.49	3.96	4.05	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	0	2	8	4.33	507/1262	4.43	4.22	4.05	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	729/1259	4.58	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	571/1256	4.61	4.51	4.30	4.28	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	394/ 788	3.67	4.19	4.00	3.98	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 15 Non-major 5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 11	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 211 0201
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM
 Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 66
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	292/1481	4.52	4.41	4.29	4.40	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	228/1481	4.25	4.30	4.23	4.29	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1249	4.42	4.32	4.27	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	217/1424	4.50	4.35	4.21	4.28	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	7	4	3.75	918/1396	3.56	3.80	3.98	3.94	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute 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	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	775/1459	4.00	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	936/1480	4.51	4.63	4.68	4.68	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	651/1450	4.07	4.22	4.09	4.15	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	618/1409	4.29	4.44	4.42	4.47	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	568/1407	4.64	4.82	4.69	4.78	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	502/1399	4.27	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	591/1400	4.26	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	108/1179	4.43	4.49	3.96	4.05	4.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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	
2. Were all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	320/1256	4.61	4.51	4.30	4.28	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	1	0	4	1	3	3.56	594/ 788	3.67	4.19	4.00	3.98	3.56	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	1	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	3.85	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	3.67	****/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	4.50	4.35	4.21	4.28	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	3	2	1	4	3.17	1239/1396	3.56	3.80	3.98	3.94	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	3	4	3	3.67	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	4.00	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	4.21	1272/1407	4.64	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	3.77	1140/1400	4.26	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	4.00	****/ 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	3.00	****/ 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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 67
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 212 0101
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D
 Instructor: SLONE, JASON
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 68
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	395/1481	3.52	4.41	4.29	4.40	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	324/1481	3.34	4.30	4.23	4.29	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1249	3.35	4.32	4.27	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	240/1424	3.68	4.35	4.21	4.28	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	5	0	3	3.75	918/1396	2.97	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	3.64	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	4.42	1107/1480	4.60	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	3.55	4.22	4.09	4.15	4.64	
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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 212 0201
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D
 Instructor: REINSEL, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 69
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	1	3	9	1	0	2.71	1473/1481	3.52	4.41	4.29	4.40	2.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	4	4	4	2	0	2.29	1474/1481	3.34	4.30	4.23	4.29	2.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	12	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1249	3.35	4.32	4.27	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	2	1	4	5	0	3.00	1361/1424	3.68	4.35	4.21	4.28	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	1	6	0	2	2.62	1357/1396	2.97	3.80	3.98	3.94	2.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	12	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1342	3.64	3.68	4.07	4.05	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	2	7	2	2	0	0	1.55	1450/1459	2.91	4.02	4.16	4.17	1.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	989/1480	4.60	4.63	4.68	4.68	4.62	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	2	1	6	1	0	2.60	1422/1450	3.55	4.22	4.09	4.15	2.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	3	1	4	1	2	2.82	1383/1409	3.76	4.44	4.42	4.47	2.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	1076/1407	4.75	4.82	4.69	4.78	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	0	4	5	0	3.09	1316/1399	3.80	4.40	4.26	4.29	3.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	5	0	4	0	2.89	1336/1400	3.64	4.35	4.27	4.34	2.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	557/1179	4.34	4.49	3.96	4.05	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	913/1262	3.77	4.22	4.05	4.11	3.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	0	2	2	4	3.60	1079/1259	4.33	4.50	4.29	4.34	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	0	0	1	7	4.10	860/1256	4.47	4.51	4.30	4.28	4.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 788	2.83	4.19	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.32	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.00	4.07	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	4.83	4.55	4.44	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5	
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Non-major 8
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Electives 1
					Other 11

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 212 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D
 Instructor: REINSEL, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 70
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	3	2	6	1	3.07	1444/1481	3.52	4.41	4.29	4.40	3.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	4	5	0	2.86	1448/1481	3.34	4.30	4.23	4.29	2.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1118/1249	3.35	4.32	4.27	4.36	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	4	4	3	3	3.36	1311/1424	3.68	4.35	4.21	4.28	3.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	3	5	1	1	2.54	1365/1396	2.97	3.80	3.98	3.94	2.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1342	3.64	3.68	4.07	4.05	****	
7. 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	0	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	3	3	3	4	3.62	1213/1399	3.80	4.40	4.26	4.29	3.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	5	3	3.54	1222/1400	3.64	4.35	4.27	4.34	3.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	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	4.47	4.51	4.30	4.28	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 788	2.83	4.19	4.00	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 12		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 212 0401
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D
 Instructor: DROGOUL, LAURE
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 71
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	2	0	2	3	4	3.64	1311/1481	3.52	4.41	4.29	4.40	3.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	0	4	4	2	3.55	1306/1481	3.34	4.30	4.23	4.29	3.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the 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 other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	2	2	1	5	3.64	1233/1424	3.68	4.35	4.21	4.28	3.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	8	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1396	2.97	3.80	3.98	3.94	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to 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 the grading system clearly explained	5	3	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1380/1459	2.91	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1480	4.60	4.63	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	1223/1450	3.55	4.22	4.09	4.15	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 the instructor seem interested in 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 lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	2	1	6	1	3.60	1217/1399	3.80	4.40	4.26	4.29	3.60	
4. 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	549/1179	4.34	4.49	3.96	4.05	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	6	3	0	3	2	0	1	2.83	737/ 788	2.83	4.19	4.00	3.98	2.83	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 15 Non-major 8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 9	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 213 0101
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D
 Instructor: COOK, CATHY
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 72
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	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 goals	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 goals	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 goals	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 learned	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 effectiveness	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 subject	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 clearly	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	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 understanding	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 learned	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 participate	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 discussion	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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

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	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	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	3.50	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	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.68	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	5.00	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 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	5.00	****/ 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	5.00	****/ 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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Non-major 5
Electives 0					
#### - Means there are not enough					

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	11	
?	0			

Course-Section: ART 213 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D
 Instructor: ROBBINS, STEPHA
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 74
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	362/1481	4.50	4.41	4.29	4.40	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	517/1481	4.23	4.30	4.23	4.29	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	498/1249	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.36	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	557/1424	4.49	4.35	4.21	4.28	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	839/1396	3.63	3.80	3.98	3.94	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1166/1342	3.12	3.68	4.07	4.05	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1063/1459	3.60	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1349/1480	4.48	4.63	4.68	4.68	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	6	0	3.75	1098/1450	3.89	4.22	4.09	4.15	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1001/1409	4.29	4.44	4.42	4.47	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	728/1407	4.75	4.82	4.69	4.78	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	459/1399	4.16	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	829/1400	4.18	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	124/1179	4.59	4.49	3.96	4.05	4.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	862/1262	4.24	4.22	4.05	4.11	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	680/1259	4.58	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	809/1256	4.18	4.51	4.30	4.28	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	533/ 788	3.66	4.19	4.00	3.98	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 213 0401
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D
 Instructor: DAVIS, PHIL
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 75
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.41	4.29	4.40	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	942/1481	4.23	4.30	4.23	4.29	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	595/1424	4.49	4.35	4.21	4.28	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1154/1459	3.60	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	912/1480	4.48	4.63	4.68	4.68	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	997/1450	3.89	4.22	4.09	4.15	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1152/1409	4.29	4.44	4.42	4.47	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	1168/1407	4.75	4.82	4.69	4.78	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1178/1399	4.16	4.40	4.26	4.29	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1104/1400	4.18	4.35	4.27	4.34	3.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	419/1179	4.59	4.49	3.96	4.05	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1262	4.24	4.22	4.05	4.11	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1259	4.58	4.50	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256	4.18	4.51	4.30	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	3.66	4.19	4.00	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 213 0501
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D
 Instructor: BRADLEY, STEPHE
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 76
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1299/1481	4.50	4.41	4.29	4.40	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	3	3	2	1	3.11	1410/1481	4.23	4.30	4.23	4.29	3.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1249	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	773/1424	4.49	4.35	4.21	4.28	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 the grading system clearly explained	4	1	2	1	5	0	0	2.38	1433/1459	3.60	4.02	4.16	4.17	2.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	729/1480	4.48	4.63	4.68	4.68	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	2	3	1	1	3.14	1333/1450	3.89	4.22	4.09	4.15	3.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 the instructor seem interested in 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 lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	3	1	2	2	3.38	1267/1399	4.16	4.40	4.26	4.29	3.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	712/1179	4.59	4.49	3.96	4.05	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	6	2	1	2	0	1	1	2.80	740/ 788	3.66	4.19	4.00	3.98	2.80	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 214 0101
 Title DRAWING I
 Instructor: CHAN, IRENE
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 77
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	678/1481	4.45	4.41	4.29	4.40	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	769/1481	4.51	4.30	4.23	4.29	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	334/1249	4.73	4.32	4.27	4.36	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	557/1424	4.47	4.35	4.21	4.28	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1218/1396	3.25	3.80	3.98	3.94	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	5	0	1	2.60	1324/1342	3.18	3.68	4.07	4.05	2.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	909/1459	3.80	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	4.75	4.63	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	761/1450	4.35	4.22	4.09	4.15	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	514/1409	4.70	4.44	4.42	4.47	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	785/1407	4.84	4.82	4.69	4.78	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained 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 lectures contribute to what 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	590/1179	4.00	4.49	3.96	4.05	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	507/1262	4.11	4.22	4.05	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	451/1259	4.56	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	332/1256	4.61	4.51	4.30	4.28	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	105/ 788	4.38	4.19	4.00	3.98	4.75	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.63	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 214 0201
 Title DRAWING I
 Instructor: GARDNER, SYMMES
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 78
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	549/1481	4.45	4.41	4.29	4.40	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	264/1481	4.51	4.30	4.23	4.29	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	203/1249	4.73	4.32	4.27	4.36	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	406/1424	4.47	4.35	4.21	4.28	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	0	4	2	4	3.31	1181/1396	3.25	3.80	3.98	3.94	3.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	10	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	987/1342	3.18	3.68	4.07	4.05	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	0	3	4	1	4	3.50	1256/1459	3.80	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	1044/1480	4.75	4.63	4.68	4.68	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	274/1450	4.35	4.22	4.09	4.15	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	514/1409	4.70	4.44	4.42	4.47	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	500/1407	4.84	4.82	4.69	4.78	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	335/1399	4.68	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	591/1400	4.31	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	590/1179	4.00	4.49	3.96	4.05	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	810/1262	4.11	4.22	4.05	4.11	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	643/1259	4.56	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	636/1256	4.61	4.51	4.30	4.28	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	394/ 788	4.38	4.19	4.00	3.98	4.00	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.68	4.53	4.83	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.89	3.92	3.55	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	3	10	22	26	4.02	1062/1481	4.02	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	4.27	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	1	9	3	1	17	14	19	3.83	1138/1424	3.83	4.35	4.21	4.28	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	6	6	14	14	13	3.42	1130/1396	3.42	3.80	3.98	3.94	3.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	3	9	23	14	10	3.32	1189/1342	3.32	3.68	4.07	4.05	3.32	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	9	17	34	4.29	749/1459	4.29	4.02	4.16	4.17	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	4.04	4.22	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	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	3	16	40	4.63	197/1179	4.63	4.49	3.96	4.05	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	3.33	****/ 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	3.67	****/ 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	3.67	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	61	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	61	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	61	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 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	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	61	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	61	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	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	B	20						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	12	C	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	4.15	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	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	57	1	1	9	9	7	19	3.76	1154/1459	3.76	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	56	1	0	0	1	1	44	4.93	491/1480	4.93	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	4.33	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	4.69	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	4.14	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	4.27	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	3.03	1143/1262	3.03	4.22	4.05	4.11	3.03	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	67	0	10	5	7	7	7	2.89	1189/1259	2.89	4.50	4.29	4.34	2.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	67	0	6	2	7	8	13	3.56	1095/1256	3.56	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	4.50	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.63	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	100	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	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	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.89	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	97	1	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	****/ 69	****	4.68	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	97	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 63	****	5.00	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	97	1	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	****/ 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	2.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	100	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	99	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	100	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 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	3.50	****/ 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected 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	B	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	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 305 0101
 Title FILM I: MOVING IMAGES
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 81
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	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	0	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	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 315 0101
 Title VIDEO I
 Instructor: GRABILL, VIN
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 82
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	844/1481	4.25	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	822/1481	4.25	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	2	1	4	5	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	2	0	9	4.42	545/1424	4.42	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	0	4	2	3	3.17	1239/1396	3.17	3.80	3.98	4.00	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	755/1342	4.00	3.68	4.07	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	2	3	3	4	3.75	1154/1459	3.75	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1215/1480	4.25	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	2	6	3	3.83	1030/1450	3.83	4.22	4.09	4.10	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	716/1409	4.55	4.44	4.42	4.43	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	705/1407	4.82	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	523/1399	4.55	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.55	
4. Did 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	147/1179	4.73	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to 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 all students actively encouraged 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 instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	5	8	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 788	****	4.19	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 321 0101
 Title 19TH CENTURY ART
 Instructor: SMALLS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 83
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	16	0	2	0	2	8	18	4.33	749/1481	4.33	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	16	0	1	0	7	12	10	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the 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 other evaluations reflect the expected goals	17	3	0	3	7	10	6	3.73	1197/1424	3.73	4.35	4.21	4.27	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute 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 the grading system clearly explained	16	1	0	2	7	11	9	3.93	1021/1459	3.93	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	16	0	0	0	6	20	4	3.93	1398/1480	3.93	4.63	4.68	4.65	3.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	1	1	1	3	14	6	3.92	945/1450	3.92	4.22	4.09	4.10	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 the instructor seem interested in 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 lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	1	0	5	9	15	4.23	846/1399	4.23	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	3	4	22	4.53	561/1400	4.53	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	1	1	0	7	2	18	4.29	419/1179	4.29	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	5	3	2	4	3	2.82	1196/1259	2.82	4.50	4.29	4.34	2.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	3	1	7	4	3	3.17	1156/1256	3.17	4.51	4.30	4.34	3.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	28	15	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 788	****	4.19	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 4	C 4	General 2	Under-grad 46 Non-major 21
84-150	12	3.00-3.49 8	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 28	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ART 323 0101
 Title 20TH CENTURY ART
 Instructor: OTTESEN, BODIL
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 84
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	20	0	0	2	6	8	9	3.96	1106/1481	4.25	4.41	4.29	4.29	3.96	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	20	0	0	0	6	11	8	4.08	967/1481	4.37	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	20	0	1	2	1	8	13	4.20	788/1249	4.37	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	20	1	1	2	3	8	10	4.00	959/1424	4.33	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to 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 written assignments contribute to 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 the grading system clearly explained	23	0	0	2	3	6	11	4.18	836/1459	4.53	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	23	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1480	4.96	4.63	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	0	0	0	3	14	5	4.09	786/1450	4.23	4.22	4.09	4.10	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	290/1409	4.88	4.44	4.42	4.43	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1407	4.98	4.82	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	0	0	0	12	12	4.50	567/1399	4.54	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	5	18	4.67	421/1400	4.75	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	0	1	0	0	4	19	4.67	177/1179	4.72	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	5	1	7	3	3	2.89	1178/1262	3.59	4.22	4.05	4.14	2.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	2	6	4	4	3	3.00	1162/1259	3.69	4.50	4.29	4.34	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	1	5	7	1	5	3.21	1149/1256	3.91	4.51	4.30	4.34	3.21	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	4.83	4.55	4.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	45	Non-major	40
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

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

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	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	3.59	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	4.00	****/ 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	2.00	****/ 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	3.38	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	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 331 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I
 Instructor: IVY, JEANNE C.
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 87
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	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															
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	10	4.83	187/1399	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	4.36	4.19	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	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.89	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.68	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	5.00	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	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	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															
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	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	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	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: ART 331 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I
 Instructor: IVY, JEANNE C.
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 87
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 331 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I
 Instructor: BELL, KATHRYN L
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 88
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	461/1481	4.72	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	517/1481	4.63	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	263/1424	4.70	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1396	****	3.80	3.98	4.00	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute 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 explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	899/1459	4.40	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1316/1480	4.56	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	662/1450	4.36	4.22	4.09	4.10	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	514/1409	4.77	4.44	4.42	4.43	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	500/1407	4.87	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	459/1399	4.72	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.60	
4. 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	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	208/1179	4.63	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what 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 all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	304/1259	4.83	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	0	2	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	358/ 788	4.36	4.19	4.00	4.07	4.13	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 332 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II
 Instructor: WITKOWSKI, TRIS
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 89
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	600/1481	4.65	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	286/1481	4.69	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	1	11	4.62	393/1249	4.65	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	1	0	9	4.33	645/1424	4.55	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	791/1396	3.81	3.80	3.98	4.00	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	542/1342	3.63	3.68	4.07	4.12	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	196/1459	4.79	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	1006/1480	4.42	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	296/1450	4.55	4.22	4.09	4.10	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	514/1409	4.85	4.44	4.42	4.43	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	804/1407	4.88	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	256/1399	4.69	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	591/1400	4.48	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	0	1	2	8	4.08	566/1179	4.31	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	85/ 788	4.92	4.19	4.00	4.07	4.83	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 14 Non-major 4
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 responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 8	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ART 332 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II
 Instructor: WITKOWSKI, TRIS
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 90
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	203/1481	4.65	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	286/1481	4.69	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	298/1249	4.65	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	209/1424	4.55	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	959/1396	3.81	3.80	3.98	4.00	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	8	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1269/1342	3.63	3.68	4.07	4.12	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	143/1459	4.79	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1215/1480	4.42	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	304/1450	4.55	4.22	4.09	4.10	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 instructor seem interested in 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 lecture material presented and 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 lectures contribute to 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	238/1179	4.31	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	507/1262	4.42	4.22	4.05	4.14	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	451/1259	4.50	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 788	4.92	4.19	4.00	4.07	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 333 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN III
 Instructor: CAMPBELL, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 91
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	225/1481	4.82	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	361/1481	4.68	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	142/1249	4.77	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1424	4.86	4.35	4.21	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	101/1459	4.70	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	9	2	0	3.18	1463/1480	3.45	4.63	4.68	4.65	3.18	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1055/1450	4.01	4.22	4.09	4.10	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor'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 instructor seem interested in 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 lecture material presented and explained 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 lectures 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1179	4.25	4.49	3.96	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	3	4	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	394/ 788	4.28	4.19	4.00	4.07	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	1
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 333 0301
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN III
 Instructor: CAMPBELL, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 92
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	225/1481	4.82	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	255/1481	4.68	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	369/1249	4.77	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	240/1424	4.86	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to 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 written assignments contribute to 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 the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	460/1459	4.70	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	4	6	1	3.73	1442/1480	3.45	4.63	4.68	4.65	3.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	662/1450	4.01	4.22	4.09	4.10	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	603/1409	4.50	4.44	4.42	4.43	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	997/1407	4.64	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	203/1399	4.64	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	239/1400	4.59	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	442/1179	4.25	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	164/ 788	4.28	4.19	4.00	4.07	4.56	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 13 Non-major 5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 334 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN IV
 Instructor: ABRAHAM, GUENET
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 93
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	918/1481	4.27	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	959/1481	4.22	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	807/1424	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	0	0	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	8	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1342	****	3.68	4.07	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1063/1459	3.81	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	1324/1480	3.85	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.22	4.09	4.10	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1098/1409	3.76	4.44	4.42	4.43	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	568/1407	4.72	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	713/1399	3.94	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	953/1400	3.93	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	111/1179	4.80	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	89/ 788	4.15	4.19	4.00	4.07	4.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	7
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 334 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN IV
 Instructor: RE, PEGGY
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 94
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	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	4.45	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	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 335 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN V
 Instructor: RE, PEGGY
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 95
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	7	0	0	4	6	7	13	3.97	1106/1481	3.97	4.41	4.29	4.29	3.97	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	5	4	11	10	3.87	1142/1481	3.87	4.30	4.23	4.23	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	3	3	4	6	14	3.83	1009/1249	3.83	4.32	4.27	4.28	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	16	0	4	3	2	3	3.33	1316/1424	3.33	4.35	4.21	4.27	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to 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 written assignments contribute 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 the grading system clearly explained	7	1	0	2	1	12	14	4.31	719/1459	4.31	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	1	0	0	1	21	7	4.21	1253/1480	4.21	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	4	8	8	3	3.43	1253/1450	3.43	4.22	4.09	4.10	3.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	1	5	12	10	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.44	4.42	4.43	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	1	1	4	8	15	4.21	1276/1407	4.21	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.21	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	2	2	6	11	8	3.72	1174/1399	3.72	4.40	4.26	4.27	3.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	4	6	7	13	3.97	1045/1400	3.97	4.35	4.27	4.28	3.97	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	0	1	8	6	10	4.00	590/1179	4.00	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	4	1	4	6	6	3.43	1026/1262	3.43	4.22	4.05	4.14	3.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	2	5	3	9	3.71	1055/1259	3.71	4.50	4.29	4.34	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	3	5	4	9	3.90	984/1256	3.90	4.51	4.30	4.34	3.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	14	0	0	4	3	0	3.43	****/ 788	****	4.19	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 37 Non-major 12
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 28	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 341 0101
 Title INTRO TO ANIMATION
 Instructor: DYER, ERIC G
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 96
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	225/1481	4.64	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	255/1481	4.48	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	9	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1249	4.30	4.32	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1424	4.88	4.35	4.21	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	0	2	3	1	2.55	1364/1396	3.20	3.80	3.98	4.00	2.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	3.68	4.07	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	836/1459	4.05	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1480	4.88	4.63	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	473/1450	4.45	4.22	4.09	4.10	4.40	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 instructor seem interested in 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 material presented and 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 lectures contribute to 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	108/1179	4.86	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.82	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	631/1262	4.30	4.22	4.05	4.14	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	451/1259	4.76	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	723/1256	4.52	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	690/ 788	3.71	4.19	4.00	4.07	3.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 341 0201
 Title INTRO TO ANIMATION
 Instructor: DYER, ERIC G
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 97
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	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	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	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1407	4.86	4.82	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	212/1399	4.35	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.80	
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	
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 responses to be significant
			P 0		
			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

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	3	3	10	27	4.42	665/1481	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	10	4.17	840/1424	4.17	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	9	6	24	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	623/1459	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															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	7	31	4.70	514/1409	4.70	4.44	4.42	4.43	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	0	4	35	4.82	682/1407	4.82	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	11	27	4.56	502/1399	4.56	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	7	6	26	4.34	779/1400	4.34	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	1	0	3	2	32	4.68	167/1179	4.68	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.68	
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	3.50	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	4.17	****/ 788	****	4.19	4.00	4.07	****	
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	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.83	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	42	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	42	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	42	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	42	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	4.67	****	

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	23						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	5	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 347 0101
 Title WRITING FOR FILM
 Instructor: COOK, CATHY
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 99
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	395/1481	4.67	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	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	2	10	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	502/1396	4.25	3.80	3.98	4.00	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	303/1342	4.50	3.68	4.07	4.12	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	702/1480	4.91	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	259/1450	4.60	4.22	4.09	4.10	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	1068/1409	4.20	4.44	4.42	4.43	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	783/1399	4.30	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	829/1400	4.30	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	108/1179	4.82	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	437/1262	4.40	4.22	4.05	4.14	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	451/1259	4.67	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	296/1256	4.80	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	2	0	1	3	1	3.14	705/ 788	3.14	4.19	4.00	4.07	3.14	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 1		

Course-Section: ART 350 0101
 Title CONSTRUCTED ENVIRONMEN
 Instructor: PEREGOY, CHRIST
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 100
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	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	0	0	2	4	0	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	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 351 0101
 Title BLACK & WHITE PHOTO
 Instructor: Silberg, Steven
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 101
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.41	4.29	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															
1. 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	4.22	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	3.89	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	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 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	4.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	1	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	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.68	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	5.00	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	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	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	5.00	****/ 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	3.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	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	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	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: ART 351 0101
 Title BLACK & WHITE PHOTO
 Instructor: Silberg, Steven
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 101
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 352 0101
 Title SEQUENCE AND TIME
 Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 102
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	505/1481	4.56	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected 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 exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	287/1424	4.67	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	633/1396	4.11	3.80	3.98	4.00	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1011/1342	3.71	3.68	4.07	4.12	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	402/1459	4.56	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	729/1480	4.89	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	259/1450	4.60	4.22	4.09	4.10	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor'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 instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	153/1399	4.88	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	468/1400	4.63	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	94/1179	4.88	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.50	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	278/ 788	4.29	4.19	4.00	4.07	4.29	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 1		

Course-Section: ART 353 0101
 Title COLOR PHOTOGRAPHY
 Instructor: PEREGOY, CHRIST
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 103
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	8	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	173/1481	4.89	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	128/1481	4.89	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	846/1249	4.11	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	287/1424	4.67	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1342	****	3.68	4.07	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	695/1459	4.33	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	863/1480	4.78	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1450	****	4.22	4.09	4.10	****	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	968/1409	4.33	4.44	4.42	4.43	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	545/1407	4.89	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	376/1399	4.67	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.67	
4. Did the lectures 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. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	233/1179	4.56	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	489/1259	4.63	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	496/1256	4.63	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	152/ 788	4.60	4.19	4.00	4.07	4.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		Major 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 17
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 8	
			? 0		

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

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	831/1481	4.27	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	7	3	3.73	1216/1481	3.73	4.30	4.23	4.23	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	2	0	3	1	3	3.33	1147/1249	3.33	4.32	4.27	4.28	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	2	6	4	3.79	1170/1424	3.79	4.35	4.21	4.27	3.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	1	5	2	1	2.75	1345/1396	2.75	3.80	3.98	4.00	2.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	5	3	1	2.67	1323/1342	2.67	3.68	4.07	4.12	2.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	4	2	3	4	1	2.71	1416/1459	2.71	4.02	4.16	4.17	2.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	491/1480	4.93	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	6	2	0	3.00	1354/1450	3.00	4.22	4.09	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	4.42	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	4.08	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	742/ 788	2.75	4.19	4.00	4.07	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	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.68	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	5.00	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	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	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	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 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															
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	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	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	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	4.67	****	

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ART 375 0101
 Title PHOTO/DIG PROC IN PRIN
 Instructor: JEON, DIANA N
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 105
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	4	5	2	3.54	1347/1481	3.54	4.41	4.29	4.29	3.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	1	6	3	0	3.00	1420/1481	3.00	4.30	4.23	4.23	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	10	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	3	4	3	2	3.33	1316/1424	3.33	4.35	4.21	4.27	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	0	3	2	0	2.20	1337/1342	2.20	3.68	4.07	4.12	2.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	1	2	7	0	3.17	1356/1459	3.17	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1107/1480	4.42	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	0	6	0	0	2.71	1413/1450	2.71	4.22	4.09	4.10	2.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	7	3	0	3.30	1332/1409	3.30	4.44	4.42	4.43	3.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	930/1407	4.70	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and 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 the lectures contribute 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	1095/1179	2.83	4.49	3.96	4.02	2.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	6	7	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 788	****	4.19	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 382 0101
 Title INTERACTIVITY
 Instructor: THWING, JENNIE
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 106
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	478/1481	4.58	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	607/1424	4.36	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	3.68	4.07	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	1	1	3	2	3	3.50	1256/1459	3.50	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	10	2	4.17	1281/1480	4.17	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching 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 the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	670/1409	4.58	4.44	4.42	4.43	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	1107/1407	4.50	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	567/1399	4.50	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	259/1179	4.50	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	816/1262	3.88	4.22	4.05	4.14	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	729/1259	4.33	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	791/1256	4.22	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 788	****	4.19	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	6
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 384 0101
 Title COMPUTER ANIMATION
 Instructor: McIntyre, Frank
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 107
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	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	4.82	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/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	4.40	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	4.18	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	4.33	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	4.82	4.44	4.42	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	4.64	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	4.91	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	0	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	4.71	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	4.86	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.86	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 385 0101
 Title DIGITAL MONTAGE
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 108
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	143/1481	4.92	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	103/1481	4.92	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect 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 other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	122/1424	4.92	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	193/1396	4.67	3.80	3.98	4.00	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	303/1342	4.50	3.68	4.07	4.12	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	595/1459	4.42	4.02	4.16	4.17	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1006/1480	4.58	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	154/1450	4.78	4.22	4.09	4.10	4.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	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	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.35	4.27	4.28	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	104/1179	4.83	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.22	4.05	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	229/1259	4.89	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.19	4.00	4.07	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 388 0101
 Title ART ON THE INTERNET
 Instructor: HOWELL, BRENDAN
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 109
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	626/1481	4.44	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	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	3	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	3.68	4.07	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	1142/1459	3.78	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1316/1480	4.11	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1098/1450	3.75	4.22	4.09	4.10	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1222/1409	3.89	4.44	4.42	4.43	3.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	963/1407	4.67	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	5	3	1	3.56	1227/1399	3.56	4.40	4.26	4.27	3.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	0	5	4.00	1017/1400	4.00	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.00	
5. Did 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	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	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	6	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.19	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 389 0101
 Title TOPICS IN COMPUTER ART
 Instructor: DYER, ERIC G (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 110
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	2	6	4.09	1012/1481	4.09	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	4	1	3.45	1342/1481	3.45	4.30	4.23	4.23	3.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1186/1424	3.75	4.35	4.21	4.27	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1396	****	3.80	3.98	4.00	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	3.68	4.07	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1380/1459	3.00	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	974/1480	4.64	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1081/1450	3.76	4.22	4.09	4.10	3.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	4	2	1	3.22	1341/1409	3.22	4.44	4.42	4.43	3.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1069/1407	4.56	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and 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	2	0	0	2	3	2	2	3.44	1245/1400	3.44	4.35	4.27	4.28	3.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	442/1179	4.25	4.49	3.96	4.02	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 techniques successful	6	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.19	4.00	4.07	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 389 0101
 Title TOPICS IN COMPUTER ART
 Instructor: DYER, ERIC G (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 111
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	2	6	4.09	1012/1481	4.09	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	4	1	3.45	1342/1481	3.45	4.30	4.23	4.23	3.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1186/1424	3.75	4.35	4.21	4.27	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1396	****	3.80	3.98	4.00	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	3.68	4.07	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1380/1459	3.00	4.02	4.16	4.17	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	974/1480	4.64	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1098/1450	3.76	4.22	4.09	4.10	3.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1409	3.22	4.44	4.42	4.43	3.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1407	4.56	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1399	3.56	4.40	4.26	4.27	3.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to 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	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 techniques successful	6	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.19	4.00	4.07	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 423 0101
 Title ART SINCE 1945
 Instructor: JACOB, PREMINDA
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 112
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	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	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 424 0101
 Title CONTEMP ART,THEORY, CR
 Instructor: SPITZ, ELLEN
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 113
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 428 0101
 Title THEORY/PRAC ART MUSEUM
 Instructor: JACOB, PREMINDA
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 114
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	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	0	3	10	4.77	219/1481	4.77	4.30	4.23	4.32	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	4.27	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	5.00	4.22	4.09	4.28	5.00	
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	12	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	4.92	4.49	3.96	4.07	4.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	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	4.50	****/ 68	****	4.89	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.68	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 63	****	5.00	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 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	4.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.00	4.56	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.91	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.26	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.42	4.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	
				I 0	Other 13
				? 0	

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

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

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	2	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	0	4	1	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	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1009/1249	3.83	4.32	4.27	4.44	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	2	1	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	1	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	2	3	3	1	9	3.67	1039/1342	3.67	3.68	4.07	4.21	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	2	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	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	0	1	1	1	4	9	4.19	1074/1409	4.19	4.44	4.42	4.51	4.19	
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	2	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	0	1	0	4	2	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	0	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	7	0	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	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.87	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.43	****	
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	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	4.89	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	4.68	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 63	****	5.00	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.89	3.92	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.00	4.56	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.91	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.26	4.72	****	
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															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	4.83	4.55	4.86	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.71	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 431 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN VII
 Instructor: IVY, JEANNE C.
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 116
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	316/1481	4.74	4.41	4.29	4.45	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	201/1481	4.79	4.30	4.23	4.32	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	13	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.32	4.27	4.44	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	1	0	0	5	13	4.53	416/1424	4.53	4.35	4.21	4.35	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	13	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	584/1396	4.17	3.80	3.98	4.09	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	9	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	303/1342	4.50	3.68	4.07	4.21	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	2	0	1	3	13	4.32	719/1459	4.32	4.02	4.16	4.25	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	936/1480	4.68	4.63	4.68	4.74	4.68	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	69/1450	4.94	4.22	4.09	4.28	4.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.44	4.42	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	350/1407	4.94	4.82	4.69	4.79	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	162/1399	4.87	4.40	4.26	4.36	4.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	177/1400	4.88	4.35	4.27	4.38	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	99/1179	4.86	4.49	3.96	4.07	4.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	146/1262	4.86	4.22	4.05	4.33	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	257/1259	4.86	4.50	4.29	4.57	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	173/1256	4.93	4.51	4.30	4.60	4.93	
4. Were special 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 assigned 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 instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.68	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	5.00	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.89	3.92	4.10	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.42	4.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors 0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major 8
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	4	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	17			
				? 1					

Course-Section: ART 440 0101
 Title FLIM/VIDEO PROJECTS
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 117
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	1	0	5	4	3.67	1299/1481	3.50	4.41	4.29	4.45	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	6	4	4.00	1000/1481	4.08	4.30	4.23	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1160/1424	4.03	4.35	4.21	4.35	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	877/1396	3.03	3.80	3.98	4.09	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	592/1342	3.52	3.68	4.07	4.21	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	5	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	872/1459	4.07	4.02	4.16	4.25	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1480	4.92	4.63	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	334/1450	4.25	4.22	4.09	4.28	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	514/1409	4.43	4.44	4.42	4.51	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	500/1407	4.78	4.82	4.69	4.79	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	459/1399	4.22	4.40	4.26	4.36	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	162/1179	4.60	4.49	3.96	4.07	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	589/1262	4.03	4.22	4.05	4.33	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	548/1259	4.03	4.50	4.29	4.57	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1256	4.83	4.51	4.30	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.19	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 440 0201
 Title FLIM/VIDEO PROJECTS
 Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 118
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	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	2.83	1313/1342	3.52	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	4.92	4.63	4.68	4.74	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	836/1450	4.25	4.22	4.09	4.28	4.00	
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	3.83	842/1262	4.03	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	4.03	4.50	4.29	4.57	3.50	
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	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 447 0101
 Title 2D ANIMATION/COMPOSITI
 Instructor: MALDONADA, JORG
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 119
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	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	5.00	****/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	3.60	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	3	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	4.50	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	3.67	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	0	4	1	3	3.88	712/1179	3.88	4.49	3.96	4.07	3.88	
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	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 457 0101
 Title PHOTO SENIOR THESIS II
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 120
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	268/1481	4.78	4.41	4.29	4.45	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	210/1481	4.78	4.30	4.23	4.32	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	437/1424	4.50	4.35	4.21	4.35	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	816/1396	3.89	3.80	3.98	4.09	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1145/1342	3.44	3.68	4.07	4.21	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.02	4.16	4.25	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1158/1480	4.33	4.63	4.68	4.74	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	334/1450	4.50	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	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	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	1	2	6	4.56	513/1399	4.56	4.40	4.26	4.36	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	791/1400	4.33	4.35	4.27	4.38	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	590/1179	4.00	4.49	3.96	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	205/1262	4.75	4.22	4.05	4.33	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	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	8	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.60	5.00	

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	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	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	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 465 0101
 Title INTERMEDIA STUDIO
 Instructor: CHAN, IRENE
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 121
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	478/1481	4.58	4.41	4.29	4.45	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	909/1481	4.17	4.30	4.23	4.32	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	4	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	2	3	6	4.36	411/1396	4.36	3.80	3.98	4.09	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to 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 the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	5	3	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	1	10	4.91	702/1480	4.91	4.63	4.68	4.74	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching 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 the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	383/1409	4.78	4.44	4.42	4.51	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	753/1399	4.33	4.40	4.26	4.36	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	590/1179	4.00	4.49	3.96	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	391/1262	4.45	4.22	4.05	4.33	4.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	294/1259	4.82	4.50	4.29	4.57	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	288/1256	4.82	4.51	4.30	4.60	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.19	4.00	4.26	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 494 0115
 Title INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: RE, PEGGY
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 122
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 494 0125
 Title INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: PEREGOY, CHRIST
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 123
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	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	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 494 0130
 Title INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 124
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 494 0142
 Title INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 125
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	549/1481	4.17	4.41	4.29	4.45	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.30	4.23	4.32	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.35	4.21	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	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	0	0	2	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	1	1	4.50	334/1450	4.83	4.22	4.09	4.28	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1152/1409	4.67	4.44	4.42	4.51	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	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	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1017/1400	4.67	4.35	4.27	4.38	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.50	4.29	4.57	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what 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 you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.56	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.91	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	5.00	4.26	4.72	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.42	4.83	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	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	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.68	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 63	****	5.00	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	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	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.00	4.56	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.91	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.26	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.42	4.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 4
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 14

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 127
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	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	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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 495 0134
 Title INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH
 Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 128
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	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	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	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	0	1	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	5.00	4.83	5.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 495 0143
 Title INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 129
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 495 0145
 Title INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH
 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

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1481	4.77	4.41	4.29	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	228/1481	4.92	4.30	4.23	4.32	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1424	4.83	4.35	4.21	4.35	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	4.73	3.68	4.07	4.21	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	4.75	4.02	4.16	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	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	4	5.00	1/1450	4.88	4.22	4.09	4.28	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	3	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	3	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	3	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	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.82	5.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 638 0120
 Title TEACH PRACTICUM
 Instructor: CHAN, IRENE
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 131
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	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	
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	1	0	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.22	4.09	3.96	4.00	
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	
4. Did the lectures contribute to 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your 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 class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.50	4.29	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	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 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	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.95	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	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	5.00	4.83	5.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	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	4.51	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.19	4.00	3.97	5.00	
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	
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	5.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.83	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

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 134
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 690 0144
 Title IND. STUDIES
 Instructor: REINSEL, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 135
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	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	
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	5.00	
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	
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	4.00	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	3.68	4.07	4.18	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	
4. Did the lectures contribute to 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your 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 class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.50	4.29	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	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 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	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.95	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	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 690 0145
 Title IND. STUDIES
 Instructor: BOOT, LEE
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 136
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 790 0140
 Title IND. STUDIES
 Instructor: COOK, CATHY
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 137
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 792 0123
 Title THESIS PREP.
 Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 138
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Frequency Distribution

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