

Course-Section: ART 210 0101
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
 Instructor: GARDNER, SYMMES
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 72
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	1074/1522	4.24	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	607/1522	4.50	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1285	****	4.41	4.30	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	735/1476	4.55	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	948/1412	4.08	3.93	4.06	4.00	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	1227/1381	2.80	3.61	4.08	3.97	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	882/1500	4.21	4.01	4.18	4.20	4.15	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	784/1517	4.58	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	385/1497	4.44	4.15	4.11	4.11	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	931/1440	4.63	4.46	4.45	4.42	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	765/1448	4.80	4.81	4.71	4.78	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	720/1436	4.53	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	707/1432	4.46	4.38	4.29	4.31	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	480/1221	4.41	4.39	3.93	4.02	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	644/1280	4.24	4.10	4.10	4.08	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	804/1277	4.59	4.48	4.34	4.33	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	586/1269	4.63	4.46	4.31	4.33	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	426/ 854	4.40	4.01	4.02	4.00	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	5.00	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.51	4.57	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.97	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.84	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.38	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.63	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	****	****	

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 8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 13	Non-major 5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				P	0			
				I	0	Other	12	
				?	0			

Course-Section: ART 210 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
 Instructor: SHIFLET, NICOLE
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 73
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	733/1522	4.24	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	511/1522	4.50	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	****	4.41	4.30	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	178/1476	4.55	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	493/1412	4.08	3.93	4.06	4.00	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	4	5	0	0	2.27	1367/1381	2.80	3.61	4.08	3.97	2.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	770/1500	4.21	4.01	4.18	4.20	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	1161/1517	4.58	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	525/1497	4.44	4.15	4.11	4.11	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	256/1440	4.63	4.46	4.45	4.42	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	765/1448	4.80	4.81	4.71	4.78	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	415/1436	4.53	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	682/1432	4.46	4.38	4.29	4.31	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	213/1221	4.41	4.39	3.93	4.02	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	553/1280	4.24	4.10	4.10	4.08	4.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	182/1277	4.59	4.48	4.34	4.33	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	371/1269	4.63	4.46	4.31	4.33	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	8	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	88/ 854	4.40	4.01	4.02	4.00	4.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 211 0101
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM
 Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 74
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	571/1522	4.51	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	996/1522	4.33	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1285	4.57	4.41	4.30	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	444/1476	4.60	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	6	5	3.80	973/1412	3.60	3.93	4.06	4.00	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	5	2	3.33	1227/1381	3.35	3.61	4.08	3.97	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	903/1500	4.12	4.01	4.18	4.20	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	714/1517	4.81	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	2	7	1	3.64	1221/1497	4.06	4.15	4.11	4.11	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	763/1440	4.54	4.46	4.45	4.42	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	1241/1448	4.65	4.81	4.71	4.78	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	7	6	4.13	980/1436	4.45	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	8	6	4.20	928/1432	4.30	4.38	4.29	4.31	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	0	13	4.60	213/1221	4.22	4.39	3.93	4.02	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	611/1280	4.06	4.10	4.10	4.08	4.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	547/1277	4.45	4.48	4.34	4.33	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	654/1269	4.49	4.46	4.31	4.33	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	10	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 854	3.50	4.01	4.02	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.97	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.84	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.38	4.11	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	1
84-150	2	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	13				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 75
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	6	8	4.57	525/1522	4.51	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	545/1522	4.33	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	4.57	4.41	4.30	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	336/1476	4.60	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	3	2	4	5	3.79	989/1412	3.60	3.93	4.06	4.00	3.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	6	6	1	3.50	1152/1381	3.35	3.61	4.08	3.97	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	819/1500	4.12	4.01	4.18	4.20	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	952/1517	4.81	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	685/1497	4.06	4.15	4.11	4.11	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	288/1440	4.54	4.46	4.45	4.42	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	840/1448	4.65	4.81	4.71	4.78	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	279/1436	4.45	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	847/1432	4.30	4.38	4.29	4.31	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	1	0	3	8	4.23	474/1221	4.22	4.39	3.93	4.02	4.23	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	468/1280	4.06	4.10	4.10	4.08	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	594/1277	4.45	4.48	4.34	4.33	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	586/1269	4.49	4.46	4.31	4.33	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	9	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 854	3.50	4.01	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 12
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 17 Non-major 5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	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 12	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 211 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM
 Instructor: SILBERG, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 76
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	6	7	4.43	707/1522	4.51	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	763/1522	4.33	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	456/1285	4.57	4.41	4.30	4.36	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	367/1476	4.60	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	4	4	2	3.21	1299/1412	3.60	3.93	4.06	4.00	3.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	4	4	2	3.21	1254/1381	3.35	3.61	4.08	3.97	3.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	988/1500	4.12	4.01	4.18	4.20	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1517	4.81	4.56	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	602/1497	4.06	4.15	4.11	4.11	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	6	6	4.23	1063/1440	4.54	4.46	4.45	4.42	4.23	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	840/1448	4.65	4.81	4.71	4.78	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	648/1436	4.45	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	775/1432	4.30	4.38	4.29	4.31	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	739/1221	4.22	4.39	3.93	4.02	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	5	2	3.55	1013/1280	4.06	4.10	4.10	4.08	3.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	789/1277	4.45	4.48	4.34	4.33	4.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	555/1269	4.49	4.46	4.31	4.33	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	673/ 854	3.50	4.01	4.02	4.00	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 14 Non-major 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 13	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 212 0101
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D
 Instructor: SHEFFIELD, SAM
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 77
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	525/1522	3.32	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	383/1522	3.14	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1285	3.00	4.41	4.30	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	100/1476	3.43	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	585/1412	3.52	3.93	4.06	4.00	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	758/1381	2.51	3.61	4.08	3.97	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	850/1500	3.00	4.01	4.18	4.20	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	1	4.08	1365/1517	4.64	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	326/1497	3.18	4.15	4.11	4.11	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	153/1440	3.54	4.46	4.45	4.42	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1448	4.71	4.81	4.71	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	170/1436	3.15	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	478/1432	2.94	4.38	4.29	4.31	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1221	3.68	4.39	3.93	4.02	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	286/1280	3.47	4.10	4.10	4.08	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1277	4.29	4.48	4.34	4.33	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1269	3.61	4.46	4.31	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	174/ 854	3.36	4.01	4.02	4.00	4.57	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 14 Non-major 2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 6	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 14	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 212 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D
 Instructor: BRADLEY, STEPHE
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 78
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	2	1	4	2	3.18	1473/1522	3.32	4.39	4.30	4.34	3.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	3	3	1	1	2.45	1511/1522	3.14	4.30	4.26	4.29	2.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1285	3.00	4.41	4.30	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	4	2	2	3.09	1410/1476	3.43	4.30	4.22	4.20	3.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1412	3.52	3.93	4.06	4.00	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	6	0	1	1	0	1.63	1376/1381	2.51	3.61	4.08	3.97	1.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	3	0	2	3	0	2.63	1466/1500	3.00	4.01	4.18	4.20	2.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	487/1517	4.64	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	0	5	3	0	2.90	1438/1497	3.18	4.15	4.11	4.11	2.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	3	4	1	3.40	1375/1440	3.54	4.46	4.45	4.42	3.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1072/1448	4.71	4.81	4.71	4.78	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	1	4	1	1	2.60	1416/1436	3.15	4.40	4.29	4.29	2.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	2	2	1	1	2.30	1412/1432	2.94	4.38	4.29	4.31	2.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	3	0	1	4	2	3.20	1028/1221	3.68	4.39	3.93	4.02	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	1	4	2	3.44	1061/1280	3.47	4.10	4.10	4.08	3.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	560/1277	4.29	4.48	4.34	4.33	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	3	1	2	2	3.11	1203/1269	3.61	4.46	4.31	4.33	3.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	2	1	2	0	2.67	824/ 854	3.36	4.01	4.02	4.00	2.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	5.00	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.51	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 216	****	5.00	4.42	4.72	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 65	****	4.97	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	4.84	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	4.38	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.30	4.58	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.75	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: ART 212 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D
 Instructor: BRADLEY, STEPHE
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 78
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 212 0401
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D
 Instructor: DROGOUL, LAURE
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 79
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	7	2	0	2.75	1502/1522	3.32	4.39	4.30	4.34	2.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	8	2	0	2.92	1492/1522	3.14	4.30	4.26	4.29	2.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1248/1285	3.00	4.41	4.30	4.36	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	3	2	3.08	1411/1476	3.43	4.30	4.22	4.20	3.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1412	3.52	3.93	4.06	4.00	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	3	1	1	0	0	1.60	1377/1381	2.51	3.61	4.08	3.97	1.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	3	5	1	0	2.45	1473/1500	3.00	4.01	4.18	4.20	2.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	932/1517	4.64	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	1	6	1	0	2.78	1454/1497	3.18	4.15	4.11	4.11	2.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	3	3	2	0	2.67	1425/1440	3.54	4.46	4.45	4.42	2.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1001/1448	4.71	4.81	4.71	4.78	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	5	2	0	2.89	1400/1436	3.15	4.40	4.29	4.29	2.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	3	4	1	0	2.56	1399/1432	2.94	4.38	4.29	4.31	2.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	2	3	3	1	3.33	983/1221	3.68	4.39	3.93	4.02	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	6	0	3.30	1117/1280	3.47	4.10	4.10	4.08	3.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1082/1277	4.29	4.48	4.34	4.33	3.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	3	2	3	3.50	1117/1269	3.61	4.46	4.31	4.33	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	779/ 854	3.36	4.01	4.02	4.00	3.00	

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	12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	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 212 0501
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D
 Instructor: BRADLEY, STEPHE
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 80
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	4	1	3	4	1	2.77	1502/1522	3.32	4.39	4.30	4.34	2.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	3	3	1	2	2.54	1508/1522	3.14	4.30	4.26	4.29	2.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1285	3.00	4.41	4.30	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	4	3	0	2.62	1460/1476	3.43	4.30	4.22	4.20	2.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	1362/1412	3.52	3.93	4.06	4.00	2.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	1	4	1	0	2.71	1343/1381	2.51	3.61	4.08	3.97	2.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	5	1	2	2	2.75	1458/1500	3.00	4.01	4.18	4.20	2.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	389/1517	4.64	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	2	3	3	0	1	2.44	1479/1497	3.18	4.15	4.11	4.11	2.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	0	5	2	2	3.18	1399/1440	3.54	4.46	4.45	4.42	3.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	1089/1448	4.71	4.81	4.71	4.78	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	3	1	3	0	2.27	1425/1436	3.15	4.40	4.29	4.29	2.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	2	0	4	0	2.27	1413/1432	2.94	4.38	4.29	4.31	2.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	3	3	1	3	3.18	1033/1221	3.68	4.39	3.93	4.02	3.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	2	2	2	1	2.45	1260/1280	3.47	4.10	4.10	4.08	2.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	1013/1277	4.29	4.48	4.34	4.33	3.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	2	1	4	1	2.82	1237/1269	3.61	4.46	4.31	4.33	2.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	747/ 854	3.36	4.01	4.02	4.00	3.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	0
84-150	0	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	13
			? 1		

Course-Section: ART 213 0101
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D
 Instructor: BELL, KATHRYN L
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 81
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	433/1522	4.47	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	233/1522	4.53	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	4.50	4.41	4.30	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	425/1476	4.40	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1225/1412	3.41	3.93	4.06	4.00	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1381	2.95	3.61	4.08	3.97	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	483/1500	4.05	4.01	4.18	4.20	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	532/1517	4.59	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	654/1497	3.98	4.15	4.11	4.11	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	452/1440	4.74	4.46	4.45	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1448	4.94	4.81	4.71	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	457/1436	4.59	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	502/1432	4.56	4.38	4.29	4.31	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	83/1221	4.86	4.39	3.93	4.02	4.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	585/1280	4.35	4.10	4.10	4.08	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	254/1277	4.73	4.48	4.34	4.33	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	381/1269	4.68	4.46	4.31	4.33	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	314/ 854	3.95	4.01	4.02	4.00	4.29	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 1
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 213 0201
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D
 Instructor: BELL, KATHRYN L
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 82
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	4	4.50	605/1522	4.47	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	358/1522	4.53	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.41	4.30	4.36	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	316/1476	4.40	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	1225/1412	3.41	3.93	4.06	4.00	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1381	2.95	3.61	4.08	3.97	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1147/1500	4.05	4.01	4.18	4.20	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	645/1517	4.59	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	898/1497	3.98	4.15	4.11	4.11	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1440	4.74	4.46	4.45	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1448	4.94	4.81	4.71	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1436	4.59	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	527/1432	4.56	4.38	4.29	4.31	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1221	4.86	4.39	3.93	4.02	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	477/1280	4.35	4.10	4.10	4.08	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	317/1277	4.73	4.48	4.34	4.33	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	509/1269	4.68	4.46	4.31	4.33	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	625/ 854	3.95	4.01	4.02	4.00	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 213 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D
 Instructor: BELL, KATHRYN L
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 83
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	4	5	4.17	991/1522	4.47	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	787/1522	4.53	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1285	4.50	4.41	4.30	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	671/1476	4.40	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	3	1	2	2	3.11	1317/1412	3.41	3.93	4.06	4.00	3.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	1362/1381	2.95	3.61	4.08	3.97	2.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	871/1500	4.05	4.01	4.18	4.20	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1152/1517	4.59	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	6	4	0	3.40	1325/1497	3.98	4.15	4.11	4.11	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	740/1440	4.74	4.46	4.45	4.42	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	548/1448	4.94	4.81	4.71	4.78	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	601/1436	4.59	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	454/1432	4.56	4.38	4.29	4.31	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	114/1221	4.86	4.39	3.93	4.02	4.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	477/1280	4.35	4.10	4.10	4.08	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	442/1277	4.73	4.48	4.34	4.33	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	437/1269	4.68	4.46	4.31	4.33	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	555/ 854	3.95	4.01	4.02	4.00	3.83	

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	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		Graduate 1
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 1		

Course-Section: ART 213 0401
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D
 Instructor: BELL, KATHRYN L
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 84
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	0	1	7	4.56	548/1522	4.47	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	787/1522	4.53	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	7	1	4.00	1009/1476	4.40	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1045/1412	3.41	3.93	4.06	4.00	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	5	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1152/1381	2.95	3.61	4.08	3.97	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1183/1500	4.05	4.01	4.18	4.20	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	1284/1517	4.59	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.22	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	622/1497	3.98	4.15	4.11	4.11	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	604/1440	4.74	4.46	4.45	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	548/1448	4.94	4.81	4.71	4.78	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	672/1436	4.59	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	820/1432	4.56	4.38	4.29	4.31	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	114/1221	4.86	4.39	3.93	4.02	4.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	530/1280	4.35	4.10	4.10	4.08	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	560/1277	4.73	4.48	4.34	4.33	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	461/1269	4.68	4.46	4.31	4.33	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	426/ 854	3.95	4.01	4.02	4.00	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	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 214 0101
 Title DRAWING I
 Instructor: CHAN, IRENE
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 85
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	1122/1522	4.38	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	1042/1522	4.23	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1285	****	4.41	4.30	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	903/1476	3.83	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	2	1	0	1	0	2.00	1402/1412	2.00	3.93	4.06	4.00	2.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	6	2	0	0	1	1.67	1374/1381	1.67	3.61	4.08	3.97	1.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	2	4	3	3.38	1363/1500	3.59	4.01	4.18	4.20	3.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	1	4.08	1365/1517	4.54	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	1	1	7	1	3.33	1346/1497	3.67	4.15	4.11	4.11	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	864/1440	4.60	4.46	4.45	4.42	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	737/1448	4.91	4.81	4.71	4.78	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	1008/1436	4.17	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	995/1432	4.21	4.38	4.29	4.31	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	556/1221	4.13	4.39	3.93	4.02	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	677/1280	4.11	4.10	4.10	4.08	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	245/1277	4.89	4.48	4.34	4.33	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	461/1269	4.67	4.46	4.31	4.33	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 854	****	4.01	4.02	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.97	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.84	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.38	4.11	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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 214 0201
 Title DRAWING I
 Instructor: PENNY, JOHN E
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 86
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	320/1522	4.38	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	738/1522	4.23	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	1324/1476	3.83	4.30	4.22	4.20	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1147/1500	3.59	4.01	4.18	4.20	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1517	4.54	4.56	4.65	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	898/1497	3.67	4.15	4.11	4.11	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	452/1440	4.60	4.46	4.45	4.42	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1448	4.91	4.81	4.71	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	876/1436	4.17	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	820/1432	4.21	4.38	4.29	4.31	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1221	4.13	4.39	3.93	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1280	4.11	4.10	4.10	4.08	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1277	4.89	4.48	4.34	4.33	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1269	4.67	4.46	4.31	4.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

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

Course-Section: ART 220 0101
 Title ART HISTORY I
 Instructor: BAXTER, BARBARA
 Enrollment: 111
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 87
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	0	0	1	5	22	25	4.34	814/1522	4.34	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.34	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	7	18	28	4.40	714/1522	4.40	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	1	16	34	4.60	435/1285	4.60	4.41	4.30	4.36	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	1	1	6	23	19	4.16	892/1476	4.16	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.16	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	8	4	14	24	4.08	709/1412	4.08	3.93	4.06	4.00	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	3	16	17	15	3.81	1016/1381	3.81	3.61	4.08	3.97	3.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	9	17	25	4.21	829/1500	4.21	4.01	4.18	4.20	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	23	29	4.51	1080/1517	4.51	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.51	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	11	27	8	3.89	1041/1497	3.89	4.15	4.11	4.11	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	5	12	35	4.53	774/1440	4.53	4.46	4.45	4.42	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	17	34	4.58	1089/1448	4.58	4.81	4.71	4.78	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	22	27	4.42	708/1436	4.42	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	3	13	35	4.53	611/1432	4.53	4.38	4.29	4.31	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	1	1	11	36	4.60	213/1221	4.60	4.39	3.93	4.02	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	4	3	7	5	10	3.48	1041/1280	3.48	4.10	4.10	4.08	3.48	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	1	2	6	7	13	4.00	930/1277	4.00	4.48	4.34	4.33	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	2	1	5	7	14	4.03	868/1269	4.03	4.46	4.31	4.33	4.03	
4. Were special techniques successful	25	20	2	2	1	1	4	3.30	****/ 854	****	4.01	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 228	****	5.00	4.35	4.56	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 65	****	4.97	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.84	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.38	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.30	4.58	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	1	A 22	Required for Majors 21	Graduate 0	Major	17
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	B 21				
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C 4	General 5	Under-grad 55	Non-major	38
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	9	D 0				

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				P	0			
				I	0	Other	21	
				?	1			

Course-Section: ART 221 0101
 Title ART HISTORY II
 Instructor: OTTESEN, BODIL
 Enrollment: 102
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 88
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	11	23	22	4.00	1122/1522	4.00	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	5	15	22	17	3.77	1257/1522	3.77	4.30	4.26	4.29	3.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	13	26	19	4.03	921/1285	4.03	4.41	4.30	4.36	4.03	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	5	15	20	14	3.80	1178/1476	3.80	4.30	4.22	4.20	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	15	15	27	4.07	722/1412	4.07	3.93	4.06	4.00	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	6	13	21	16	3.79	1028/1381	3.79	3.61	4.08	3.97	3.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	15	18	23	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.01	4.18	4.20	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	20	40	4.64	963/1517	4.64	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	4	11	28	4	3.68	1192/1497	3.68	4.15	4.11	4.11	3.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	3	5	18	34	4.33	991/1440	4.33	4.46	4.45	4.42	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	13	45	4.72	935/1448	4.72	4.81	4.71	4.78	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	4	28	23	4.17	957/1436	4.17	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	4	8	15	31	4.20	922/1432	4.20	4.38	4.29	4.31	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	1	4	12	38	4.46	319/1221	4.46	4.39	3.93	4.02	4.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	8	4	8	4	6	2.87	1229/1280	2.87	4.10	4.10	4.08	2.87	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	32	0	2	7	10	3	7	3.21	1197/1277	3.21	4.48	4.34	4.33	3.21	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	2	4	13	6	3	3.14	1197/1269	3.14	4.46	4.31	4.33	3.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	31	28	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 854	****	4.01	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	58	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 228	****	5.00	4.35	4.56	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	60	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	60	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.97	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.84	4.45	5.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	60	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.30	4.58	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.63	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	15	0.00-0.99 0	A 25	Required for Majors	26
28-55	11	1.00-1.99 0	B 21		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 5	C 10	General	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		Under-grad 61
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 16	F 0		Non-major 48
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1		
				Electives	1
				Other	26
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: ART 305 0101
 Title FILM I: MOVING IMAGES
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 89
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	8	4.89	190/1522	4.89	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	142/1522	4.89	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.41	4.30	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	140/1476	4.88	4.30	4.22	4.26	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	1	4	3.44	1201/1412	3.44	3.93	4.06	4.03	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1119/1381	3.63	3.61	4.08	4.13	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	435/1500	4.56	4.01	4.18	4.13	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	532/1517	4.89	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	116/1497	4.88	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	412/1440	4.78	4.46	4.45	4.46	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.81	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.30	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	187/1432	4.89	4.38	4.29	4.29	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.39	3.93	3.94	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	286/1280	4.67	4.10	4.10	4.14	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	351/1277	4.78	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	361/1269	4.78	4.46	4.31	4.39	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	380/ 854	4.17	4.01	4.02	4.00	4.17	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	3	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	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 314 0101
 Title DRAWING II
 Instructor: CHAN, IRENE
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 90
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	4	0	2	0	2	3	3	3.50	1402/1522	3.50	4.39	4.30	4.34	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	2	0	4	2	2	3.20	1458/1522	3.20	4.30	4.26	4.25	3.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	1222/1476	3.70	4.30	4.22	4.26	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	9	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1412	****	3.93	4.06	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	2	4	2	0	1	2.33	1365/1381	2.33	3.61	4.08	4.13	2.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	2	5	2	0	3.00	1430/1500	3.00	4.01	4.18	4.13	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	1355/1517	4.10	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	2	4	1	3.44	1305/1497	3.44	4.15	4.11	4.13	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	798/1440	4.50	4.46	4.45	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1001/1448	4.67	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	957/1436	4.17	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1036/1432	4.00	4.38	4.29	4.29	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	606/1221	4.00	4.39	3.93	3.94	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	4	1	3.67	959/1280	3.67	4.10	4.10	4.14	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	0	0	4	3.83	1038/1277	3.83	4.48	4.34	4.38	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	721/1269	4.33	4.46	4.31	4.39	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	588/ 854	3.75	4.01	4.02	4.00	3.75

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 315 0101
 Title VIDEO I
 Instructor: GRABILL, VIN
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 91
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	3	7	4.42	720/1522	4.42	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	787/1522	4.33	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	735/1476	4.30	4.30	4.22	4.26	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1100/1412	3.63	3.93	4.06	4.03	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1152/1381	3.50	3.61	4.08	4.13	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	3	4	3.92	1078/1500	3.92	4.01	4.18	4.13	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1152/1517	4.42	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	7	1	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	864/1440	4.45	4.46	4.45	4.46	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	916/1448	4.73	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	551/1436	4.55	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	869/1432	4.27	4.38	4.29	4.29	4.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	92/1221	4.83	4.39	3.93	3.94	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	859/1280	3.83	4.10	4.10	4.14	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	594/1277	4.50	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	200/1269	4.92	4.46	4.31	4.39	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	779/ 854	3.00	4.01	4.02	4.00	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 321 0101
 Title 19TH CENTURY ART
 Instructor: OTTESEN, BODIL
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 92
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	8	15	4.33	814/1522	4.33	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	6	16	4.30	834/1522	4.30	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	4	17	4.30	738/1285	4.30	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	4	7	14	4.27	781/1476	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.26	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	6	17	4.41	430/1412	4.41	3.93	4.06	4.03	4.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	3	3	4	12	4.14	723/1381	4.14	3.61	4.08	4.13	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	8	16	4.44	571/1500	4.44	4.01	4.18	4.13	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	389/1517	4.93	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	3	9	5	4.12	820/1497	4.12	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.12	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	8	19	4.70	552/1440	4.70	4.46	4.45	4.46	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	878/1448	4.74	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	6	16	4.41	720/1436	4.41	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	3	19	4.58	558/1432	4.58	4.38	4.29	4.29	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	3	2	19	4.56	239/1221	4.56	4.39	3.93	3.94	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	1	6	0	5	3.20	1150/1280	3.20	4.10	4.10	4.14	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	0	5	1	7	3.73	1072/1277	3.73	4.48	4.34	4.38	3.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	1	0	2	10	4.13	840/1269	4.13	4.46	4.31	4.39	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	12	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 854	****	4.01	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	4
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 27
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	20
			? 3		

Course-Section: ART 323 0101
 Title 20TH CENTURY ART
 Instructor: OTTESEN, BODIL
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 93
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	14	13	4.30	849/1522	4.51	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	8	10	12	4.13	996/1522	4.45	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	8	13	4.10	882/1285	4.48	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	7	7	11	3.96	1056/1476	4.40	4.30	4.22	4.26	3.96	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	4	5	18	4.28	547/1412	4.50	3.93	4.06	4.03	4.28	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	7	12	7	3.82	1000/1381	4.20	3.61	4.08	4.13	3.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	6	10	10	3.90	1093/1500	4.35	4.01	4.18	4.13	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	731/1517	4.73	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	3	16	6	4.12	807/1497	4.15	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.12	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	8	20	4.66	617/1440	4.73	4.46	4.45	4.46	4.66	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	346/1448	4.94	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	9	17	4.48	624/1436	4.62	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	9	18	4.55	579/1432	4.66	4.38	4.29	4.29	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	8	20	4.71	144/1221	4.79	4.39	3.93	3.94	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	5	0	8	2	6	3.19	1152/1280	3.13	4.10	4.10	4.14	3.19	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	5	6	4	4	2	2.62	1264/1277	3.24	4.48	4.34	4.38	2.62	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	3	5	2	8	3.43	1138/1269	3.95	4.46	4.31	4.39	3.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	18	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 854	****	4.01	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 228	****	5.00	4.35	4.29	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.97	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.84	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.38	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.30	4.39	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.63	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 2	Graduate 0	Major 21
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 16			
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 30	Non-major 9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D 1			
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 23		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 323 0201
 Title 20TH CENTURY ART
 Instructor: FAGAN, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 94
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	380/1522	4.51	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	244/1522	4.45	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	189/1285	4.48	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	162/1476	4.40	4.30	4.22	4.26	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	191/1412	4.50	3.93	4.06	4.03	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	272/1381	4.20	3.61	4.08	4.13	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	160/1500	4.35	4.01	4.18	4.13	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	932/1517	4.73	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	1	8	7	4.18	744/1497	4.15	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	353/1440	4.73	4.46	4.45	4.46	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	247/1448	4.94	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	279/1436	4.62	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	338/1432	4.66	4.38	4.29	4.29	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	88/1221	4.79	4.39	3.93	3.94	4.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	3	5	2	3	3.07	1181/1280	3.13	4.10	4.10	4.14	3.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	4	3	6	3.87	1027/1277	3.24	4.48	4.34	4.38	3.87	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	620/1269	3.95	4.46	4.31	4.39	4.47	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	11	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 854	****	4.01	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 228	****	5.00	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 216	****	5.00	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.97	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.84	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.38	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.75	****	

Course-Section: ART 323 0201
 Title 20TH CENTURY ART
 Instructor: FAGAN, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 94
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	21	Non-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ART 327 0101
 Title HIST. OF PHOTOGRAPHY I
 Instructor: DURANT, MARK
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 95
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	0	0	9	13	4.43	694/1522	4.43	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	6	12	4.30	824/1522	4.30	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	18	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1285	****	4.41	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	3	8	7	4.11	956/1476	4.11	4.30	4.22	4.26	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	205/1412	4.70	3.93	4.06	4.03	4.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	297/1381	4.55	3.61	4.08	4.13	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	5	7	8	3.91	1088/1500	3.91	4.01	4.18	4.13	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	668/1517	4.83	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	10	9	4.29	622/1497	4.29	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	272/1440	4.86	4.46	4.45	4.46	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.81	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	217/1436	4.81	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	19	4.81	294/1432	4.81	4.38	4.29	4.29	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	1	18	4.76	119/1221	4.76	4.39	3.93	3.94	4.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	324/1280	4.60	4.10	4.10	4.14	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	317/1277	4.80	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	266/1269	4.87	4.46	4.31	4.39	4.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	7	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	402/ 854	4.13	4.01	4.02	4.00	4.13	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	5.00	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	5.00	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.97	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.84	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.38	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: ART 327 0101
 Title HIST. OF PHOTOGRAPHY I
 Instructor: DURANT, MARK
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 95
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	11	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	23	Non-major	14
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 331 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I
 Instructor: LENZER, JANET
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 96
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	5	5	4.17	991/1522	4.17	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	787/1522	4.38	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1285	****	4.41	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	613/1476	4.54	4.30	4.22	4.26	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1412	****	3.93	4.06	4.03	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1381	****	3.61	4.08	4.13	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	700/1500	4.29	4.01	4.18	4.13	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	1268/1517	4.26	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1057/1497	3.89	4.15	4.11	4.13	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	1252/1440	4.07	4.46	4.45	4.46	3.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	965/1448	4.73	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	2	0	7	4.20	934/1436	4.10	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	1126/1432	3.95	4.38	4.29	4.29	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	860/1221	4.05	4.39	3.93	3.94	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	670/1280	4.26	4.10	4.10	4.14	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	375/1277	4.88	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	586/1269	4.45	4.46	4.31	4.39	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	426/ 854	4.20	4.01	4.02	4.00	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	1	Major	12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 331 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I
 Instructor: LENZER, JANET
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 97
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	3	4	5	4.17	991/1522	4.17	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	686/1522	4.38	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	10	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1285	****	4.41	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	316/1476	4.54	4.30	4.22	4.26	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	8	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1412	****	3.93	4.06	4.03	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	10	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1381	****	3.61	4.08	4.13	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	3	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	780/1500	4.29	4.01	4.18	4.13	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	1257/1517	4.26	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.27	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	1034/1497	3.89	4.15	4.11	4.13	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1047/1440	4.07	4.46	4.45	4.46	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	859/1448	4.73	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1056/1436	4.10	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	1036/1432	3.95	4.38	4.29	4.29	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	279/1221	4.05	4.39	3.93	3.94	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	477/1280	4.26	4.10	4.10	4.14	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1277	4.88	4.48	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	671/1269	4.45	4.46	4.31	4.39	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	252/ 854	4.20	4.01	4.02	4.00	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 2
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	10

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

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	2	9	4.58	514/1522	4.40	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	787/1522	4.17	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	****	4.41	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	473/1476	4.39	4.30	4.22	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	1410/1412	1.00	3.93	4.06	4.03	1.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1227/1381	3.33	3.61	4.08	4.13	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	1129/1500	3.57	4.01	4.18	4.13	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1011/1517	4.47	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	10	2	4.17	756/1497	4.08	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	452/1440	4.53	4.46	4.45	4.46	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	444/1448	4.92	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	855/1436	4.02	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	548/1432	4.21	4.38	4.29	4.29	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	226/1221	4.33	4.39	3.93	3.94	4.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	507/1280	4.22	4.10	4.10	4.14	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	498/1277	4.46	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	223/1269	4.53	4.46	4.31	4.39	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	779/ 854	2.50	4.01	4.02	4.00	3.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 228	****	5.00	4.35	4.29	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.97	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.84	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.38	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.30	4.39	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.63	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	1	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	11

Course-Section: ART 332 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II
 Instructor: CUSTEN, CALVIN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 99
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	9	4	4.21	939/1522	4.40	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	4	6	4.00	1080/1522	4.17	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	****	4.41	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	1	9	4.29	758/1476	4.39	4.30	4.22	4.26	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	1	5	5	1	3.31	1388/1500	3.57	4.01	4.18	4.13	3.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	1201/1517	4.47	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	898/1497	4.08	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	1007/1440	4.53	4.46	4.45	4.46	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	395/1448	4.92	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1209/1436	4.02	4.40	4.29	4.30	3.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	5	4	3.85	1152/1432	4.21	4.38	4.29	4.29	3.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	4	0	7	4.08	578/1221	4.33	4.39	3.93	3.94	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	694/1280	4.22	4.10	4.10	4.14	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	2	0	4	8	4.29	781/1277	4.46	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	836/1269	4.53	4.46	4.31	4.39	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	10	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	847/ 854	2.50	4.01	4.02	4.00	2.00	

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	12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 100
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	814/1522	4.28	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	864/1522	4.17	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	3	9	4.20	809/1285	4.29	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	367/1476	4.53	4.30	4.22	4.26	4.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	9	4.27	557/1412	4.25	3.93	4.06	4.03	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	1368/1381	2.25	3.61	4.08	4.13	2.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	6	2	6	3.80	1147/1500	3.82	4.01	4.18	4.13	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	12	2	4.07	1368/1517	4.03	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.07	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	1006/1497	3.83	4.15	4.11	4.13	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	1079/1440	4.30	4.46	4.45	4.46	4.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	1024/1448	4.63	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	5	4	3.93	1137/1436	4.04	4.40	4.29	4.30	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	862/1432	4.26	4.38	4.29	4.29	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	3	1	2	1	2.88	1111/1221	3.04	4.39	3.93	3.94	2.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	5	5	3.67	959/1280	3.79	4.10	4.10	4.14	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	692/1277	4.32	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	3	2	9	4.27	770/1269	4.33	4.46	4.31	4.39	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	8	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	240/ 854	4.07	4.01	4.02	4.00	4.43	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 13
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 15	Non-major 2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	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 14		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ART 333 0301
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN III
 Instructor: CAMPBELL, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 101
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	2	2	8	4.23	919/1522	4.28	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	1042/1522	4.17	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	666/1285	4.29	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	551/1476	4.53	4.30	4.22	4.26	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	585/1412	4.25	3.93	4.06	4.03	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1381	2.25	3.61	4.08	4.13	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	3	5	3.85	1123/1500	3.82	4.01	4.18	4.13	3.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	9	2	4.00	1389/1517	4.03	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	4	2	3.73	1167/1497	3.83	4.15	4.11	4.13	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	946/1440	4.30	4.46	4.45	4.46	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	1060/1448	4.63	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	965/1436	4.04	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	899/1432	4.26	4.38	4.29	4.29	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1028/1221	3.04	4.39	3.93	3.94	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	803/1280	3.79	4.10	4.10	4.14	3.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	2	2	8	4.23	819/1277	4.32	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.23	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	685/1269	4.33	4.46	4.31	4.39	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	604/ 854	4.07	4.01	4.02	4.00	3.71	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	5.00	4.35	4.29	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.30	4.39	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.63	5.00	****	

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
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Non-major 2
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 2	Electives 0
					Other 13

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 334 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN IV
 Instructor: LENZER, JANET
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 102
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	4	7	4.38	756/1522	4.39	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	976/1522	4.28	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1285	5.00	4.41	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	535/1476	4.53	4.30	4.22	4.26	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1412	****	3.93	4.06	4.03	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1381	****	3.61	4.08	4.13	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	945/1500	4.04	4.01	4.18	4.13	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	3	4.23	1278/1517	4.22	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.23	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	633/1497	4.04	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	798/1440	4.38	4.46	4.45	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	494/1448	4.95	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1003/1436	4.30	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.10	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	758/1432	4.45	4.38	4.29	4.29	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	1	4	2	3.56	879/1221	3.28	4.39	3.93	3.94	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	390/1280	4.25	4.10	4.10	4.14	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	508/1277	4.69	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	586/1269	4.38	4.46	4.31	4.39	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 854	4.00	4.01	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	13
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 1		Non-major 0
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 334 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN IV
 Instructor: LENZER, JANET
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 103
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	3	4.40	733/1522	4.39	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	702/1522	4.28	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.41	4.30	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	378/1476	4.53	4.30	4.22	4.26	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	988/1500	4.04	4.01	4.18	4.13	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1301/1517	4.22	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1113/1497	4.04	4.15	4.11	4.13	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1047/1440	4.38	4.46	4.45	4.46	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1448	4.95	4.81	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	601/1436	4.30	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1432	4.45	4.38	4.29	4.29	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1064/1221	3.28	4.39	3.93	3.94	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	718/1280	4.25	4.10	4.10	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	375/1277	4.69	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	777/1269	4.38	4.46	4.31	4.39	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.01	4.02	4.00	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 341 0201
 Title INTRO TO ANIMATION
 Instructor: DELANEY, RICK
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 104
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	6	4.44	681/1522	4.44	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	1080/1522	4.00	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	****	4.41	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	1141/1476	3.88	4.30	4.22	4.26	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	1	3.78	997/1412	3.78	3.93	4.06	4.03	3.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	435/1500	4.56	4.01	4.18	4.13	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.56	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	6	1	3.88	1057/1497	3.88	4.15	4.11	4.13	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	877/1440	4.44	4.46	4.45	4.46	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1207/1448	4.44	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	876/1436	4.25	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	984/1432	4.11	4.38	4.29	4.29	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	175/1221	4.67	4.39	3.93	3.94	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	834/1280	3.89	4.10	4.10	4.14	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	245/1277	4.89	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	244/1269	4.89	4.46	4.31	4.39	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	819/ 854	2.75	4.01	4.02	4.00	2.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	5.00	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 216	****	5.00	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.97	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.84	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.38	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: ART 341 0201
 Title INTRO TO ANIMATION
 Instructor: DELANEY, RICK
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 104
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 343 0101
 Title HISTORY OF ANIMATION
 Instructor: DYER, ERIC G
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 105
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	9	11	15	4.05	1088/1522	4.05	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	3	7	8	13	6	3.32	1421/1522	3.32	4.30	4.26	4.25	3.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	1	2	2	5	14	12	3.91	1018/1285	3.91	4.41	4.30	4.30	3.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	30	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	****/1476	****	4.30	4.22	4.26	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	2	4	12	17	4.08	709/1412	4.08	3.93	4.06	4.03	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	32	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	****/1381	****	3.61	4.08	4.13	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	2	3	8	8	8	8	3.29	1391/1500	3.29	4.01	4.18	4.13	3.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	24	12	4.33	1217/1517	4.33	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	2	3	7	14	3	3.45	1305/1497	3.45	4.15	4.11	4.13	3.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	5	14	17	4.27	1031/1440	4.27	4.46	4.45	4.46	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	2	4	6	24	4.44	1207/1448	4.44	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	1	1	5	12	17	4.19	934/1436	4.19	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	5	0	13	17	4.11	984/1432	4.11	4.38	4.29	4.29	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	1	1	1	6	27	4.58	226/1221	4.58	4.39	3.93	3.94	4.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	13	1	4	6	3	2.44	1261/1280	2.44	4.10	4.10	4.14	2.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	6	6	6	4	5	2.85	1248/1277	2.85	4.48	4.34	4.38	2.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	6	3	6	6	6	3.11	1203/1269	3.11	4.46	4.31	4.39	3.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	24	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 854	****	4.01	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 1 Major 31
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 7	C 8	General 5	Under-grad 44 Non-major 14
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 9	F 1	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 29	
			? 2		

Course-Section: ART 345 0101
 Title FILM II:SOUND & IMAGE
 Instructor: COOK, CATHY
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 106
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	6	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	179/1522	4.83	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	316/1476	4.67	4.30	4.22	4.26	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	231/1412	4.67	3.93	4.06	4.03	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	434/1381	4.40	3.61	4.08	4.13	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	483/1500	4.50	4.01	4.18	4.13	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.56	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.15	4.11	4.13	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	604/1440	4.67	4.46	4.45	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.81	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.30	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.38	4.29	4.29	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.39	3.93	3.94	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	390/1280	4.50	4.10	4.10	4.14	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	290/1277	4.83	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	299/1269	4.83	4.46	4.31	4.39	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	141/ 854	4.67	4.01	4.02	4.00	4.67	

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	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	2
84-150	4	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	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 347 0101
 Title WRITING FOR FILM
 Instructor: COOK, CATHY
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 107
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	275/1522	4.79	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	383/1522	4.64	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.41	4.30	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	367/1476	4.62	4.30	4.22	4.26	4.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	715/1412	4.07	3.93	4.06	4.03	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	130/1381	4.79	3.61	4.08	4.13	4.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	892/1500	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.13	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.56	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	142/1497	4.82	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	565/1440	4.69	4.46	4.45	4.46	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	395/1448	4.92	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	279/1436	4.77	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	129/1432	4.92	4.38	4.29	4.29	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	0	11	4.62	206/1221	4.62	4.39	3.93	3.94	4.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	337/1280	4.58	4.10	4.10	4.14	4.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	540/1277	4.58	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	299/1269	4.83	4.46	4.31	4.39	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	1	0	4	4	3.90	525/ 854	3.90	4.01	4.02	4.00	3.90	

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	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ART 351 0101
 Title BLACK & WHITE PHOTO
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 108
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	7	4.60	492/1522	4.60	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	432/1522	4.60	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	178/1476	4.80	4.30	4.22	4.26	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	430/1412	4.40	3.93	4.06	4.03	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	663/1381	4.20	3.61	4.08	4.13	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	630/1500	4.40	4.01	4.18	4.13	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.00	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	112/1497	4.89	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.46	4.45	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.81	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	539/1436	4.56	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	579/1432	4.56	4.38	4.29	4.29	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	81/1221	4.89	4.39	3.93	3.94	4.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	357/1280	4.56	4.10	4.10	4.14	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	470/1277	4.67	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	361/1269	4.78	4.46	4.31	4.39	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	287/ 854	4.33	4.01	4.02	4.00	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 353 0101
 Title COLOR PHOTOGRAPHY
 Instructor: PEREGOY, CHRIST
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 109
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	6	4.44	681/1522	4.44	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	358/1522	4.67	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1285	****	4.41	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	151/1476	4.86	4.30	4.22	4.26	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	688/1412	4.11	3.93	4.06	4.03	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	434/1381	4.40	3.61	4.08	4.13	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.01	4.18	4.13	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1349/1517	4.11	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	147/1497	4.80	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	716/1440	4.57	4.46	4.45	4.46	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	575/1448	4.88	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	457/1436	4.63	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	350/1432	4.75	4.38	4.29	4.29	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	83/1221	4.88	4.39	3.93	3.94	4.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	286/1280	4.67	4.10	4.10	4.14	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	470/1277	4.67	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	461/1269	4.67	4.46	4.31	4.39	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	141/ 854	4.67	4.01	4.02	4.00	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	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	7
			? 1		

Course-Section: ART 370 0101
 Title SILKSCREEN PRINTING
 Instructor: BOWLER, RUTH S
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 110
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	3	3.88	1234/1522	3.88	4.39	4.30	4.34	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1206/1522	3.88	4.30	4.26	4.25	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	****	4.41	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	0	3	3.71	1217/1476	3.71	4.30	4.22	4.26	3.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	0	0	1	0	1.75	1407/1412	1.75	3.93	4.06	4.03	1.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	1	0	1	1	2.33	1365/1381	2.33	3.61	4.08	4.13	2.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	3	1	3.38	1366/1500	3.38	4.01	4.18	4.13	3.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1471/1517	3.75	4.56	4.65	4.62	3.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1057/1497	3.88	4.15	4.11	4.13	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1136/1440	4.13	4.46	4.45	4.46	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1048/1448	4.63	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	0	5	4.00	1056/1436	4.00	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1191/1432	3.75	4.38	4.29	4.29	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	899/1221	3.50	4.39	3.93	3.94	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	0	4	3.71	934/1280	3.71	4.10	4.10	4.14	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	421/1277	4.71	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	654/1269	4.43	4.46	4.31	4.39	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.01	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 375 0101
 Title PHOTO/DIG PROC IN PRIN
 Instructor: CHAN, IRENE
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 111
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	767/1522	4.38	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	1080/1522	4.00	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	****	4.41	4.30	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1198/1476	3.75	4.30	4.22	4.26	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	760/1412	4.00	3.93	4.06	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	1	0	1	2.00	1370/1381	2.00	3.61	4.08	4.13	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1366/1500	3.38	4.01	4.18	4.13	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	1343/1517	4.13	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	782/1497	4.14	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	353/1440	4.80	4.46	4.45	4.46	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.81	4.71	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1436	4.80	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.38	4.29	4.29	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1133/1221	2.75	4.39	3.93	3.94	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	988/1280	3.60	4.10	4.10	4.14	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	527/1277	4.60	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.46	4.31	4.39	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.01	4.02	4.00	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	5.00	4.35	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.41	4.56	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.30	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.40	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.63	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	****	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 382 0101
 Title INTERACTIVITY
 Instructor: REINSEL, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 112
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	899/1522	4.25	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1365/1522	3.50	4.30	4.26	4.25	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	706/1285	4.33	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1198/1476	3.75	4.30	4.22	4.26	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	916/1412	3.88	3.93	4.06	4.03	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1381	****	3.61	4.08	4.13	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	2	3	1	3.13	1418/1500	3.13	4.01	4.18	4.13	3.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	973/1517	4.63	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1395/1497	3.17	4.15	4.11	4.13	3.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	0	3	1	0	2.50	1428/1440	2.50	4.46	4.45	4.46	2.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	1271/1448	4.33	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	3	0	3.17	1364/1436	3.17	4.40	4.29	4.30	3.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	1	0	2	2.83	1386/1432	2.83	4.38	4.29	4.29	2.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	461/1221	4.25	4.39	3.93	3.94	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1240/1280	2.75	4.10	4.10	4.14	2.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	804/1277	4.25	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1174/1269	3.25	4.46	4.31	4.39	3.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 854	****	4.01	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 385 0101
 Title DIGITAL MONTAGE
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 113
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	246/1522	4.80	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	89/1522	4.93	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1285	****	4.41	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	378/1476	4.60	4.30	4.22	4.26	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	3	6	3.71	1045/1412	3.71	3.93	4.06	4.03	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	1008/1381	3.82	3.61	4.08	4.13	3.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	680/1500	4.36	4.01	4.18	4.13	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	1144/1517	4.43	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	326/1497	4.58	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	272/1440	4.86	4.46	4.45	4.46	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.81	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	98/1436	4.93	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	558/1432	4.57	4.38	4.29	4.29	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	156/1221	4.69	4.39	3.93	3.94	4.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	459/1280	4.43	4.10	4.10	4.14	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.48	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	178/1269	4.93	4.46	4.31	4.39	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	182/ 854	4.55	4.01	4.02	4.00	4.55	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	5.00	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	5.00	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.97	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.84	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.38	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: ART 385 0101
 Title DIGITAL MONTAGE
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 113
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 388 0101
 Title ART ON THE INTERNET
 Instructor: HOWELL, BRENDAN
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 114
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	970/1522	4.18	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	854/1522	4.27	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	425/1285	4.60	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	769/1476	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.26	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1138/1412	3.56	3.93	4.06	4.03	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	5	2	3.70	1076/1381	3.70	3.61	4.08	4.13	3.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	940/1500	4.09	4.01	4.18	4.13	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1080/1517	4.50	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1174/1497	3.71	4.15	4.11	4.13	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1148/1440	4.10	4.46	4.45	4.46	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1157/1448	4.50	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	1003/1436	4.10	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.10	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1036/1432	4.00	4.38	4.29	4.29	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	327/1221	4.44	4.39	3.93	3.94	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	825/1280	3.90	4.10	4.10	4.14	3.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	849/1277	4.20	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	853/1269	4.10	4.46	4.31	4.39	4.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	240/ 854	4.43	4.01	4.02	4.00	4.43	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 5	Under-grad 11	Non-major 1
84-150	3	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 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 389A 0101
 Title: GAMES AND INTERACTION
 Instructor: REINSEL, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 115
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	404/1522	4.70	4.39	4.30	4.34	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	824/1522	4.30	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1285	****	4.41	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	265/1476	4.71	4.30	4.22	4.26	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	760/1412	4.00	3.93	4.06	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	753/1381	4.10	3.61	4.08	4.13	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1298/1500	3.50	4.01	4.18	4.13	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	1301/1517	4.20	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	506/1497	4.40	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1071/1440	4.22	4.46	4.45	4.46	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	548/1448	4.89	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	793/1436	4.33	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	454/1432	4.67	4.38	4.29	4.29	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	232/1221	4.57	4.39	3.93	3.94	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	161/1280	4.86	4.10	4.10	4.14	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	272/1277	4.86	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	277/1269	4.86	4.46	4.31	4.39	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	141/ 854	4.67	4.01	4.02	4.00	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	1	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2	
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other		5
			? 1			

Course-Section: ART 425 0101
 Title WRIT BY & ABOUT ARTIST
 Instructor: MAHONEY, JAMES
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 116
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	4	4.50	605/1522	4.50	4.39	4.30	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	545/1522	4.50	4.30	4.26	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	366/1285	4.67	4.41	4.30	4.42	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	226/1476	4.75	4.30	4.22	4.31	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	167/1412	4.75	3.93	4.06	4.11	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	149/1381	4.75	3.61	4.08	4.21	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1211/1500	3.71	4.01	4.18	4.25	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.00	4.56	4.65	4.71	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	189/1497	4.75	4.15	4.11	4.21	4.75	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	532/1440	4.71	4.46	4.45	4.52	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.81	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	170/1436	4.86	4.40	4.29	4.32	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	227/1432	4.86	4.38	4.29	4.34	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	606/1221	4.00	4.39	3.93	4.04	4.00	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	222/1280	4.75	4.10	4.10	4.28	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.48	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.46	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	106/ 854	4.75	4.01	4.02	4.31	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 429 0101
 Title SEMINAR:ART HIST & THE
 Instructor: MAHONEY, JAMES
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 117
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	9	4.73	365/1522	4.73	4.39	4.30	4.42	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	945/1522	4.18	4.30	4.26	4.34	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1285	****	4.41	4.30	4.42	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	913/1476	4.14	4.30	4.22	4.31	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	257/1412	4.64	3.93	4.06	4.11	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	673/1381	4.18	3.61	4.08	4.21	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	935/1500	4.10	4.01	4.18	4.25	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	1	4.09	1358/1517	4.09	4.56	4.65	4.71	4.09	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	104/1497	4.90	4.15	4.11	4.21	4.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.46	4.45	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.81	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.38	4.29	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	279/1221	4.50	4.39	3.93	4.04	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	311/1280	4.63	4.10	4.10	4.28	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	254/1277	4.88	4.48	4.34	4.50	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.46	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.01	4.02	4.31	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 430 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN VI
 Instructor: ABRAHAM, GUENET
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 118
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	0	0	22	4.83	232/1522	4.83	4.39	4.30	4.42	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	322/1522	4.70	4.30	4.26	4.34	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	228/1285	4.80	4.41	4.30	4.42	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	255/1476	4.73	4.30	4.22	4.31	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	339/1412	4.50	3.93	4.06	4.11	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	0	2	4	12	4.37	482/1381	4.37	3.61	4.08	4.21	4.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	3	2	2	2	12	3.86	1117/1500	3.86	4.01	4.18	4.25	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	1	0	11	9	4.18	1307/1517	4.18	4.56	4.65	4.71	4.18	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	421/1497	4.47	4.15	4.11	4.21	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	1	1	16	4.68	578/1440	4.68	4.46	4.45	4.52	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	296/1448	4.95	4.81	4.71	4.75	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	279/1436	4.76	4.40	4.29	4.32	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	1	0	0	1	14	4.69	430/1432	4.69	4.38	4.29	4.34	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	1	0	0	0	10	4.64	194/1221	4.64	4.39	3.93	4.04	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	110/1280	4.92	4.10	4.10	4.28	4.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.48	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	288/1269	4.85	4.46	4.31	4.49	4.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	88/ 854	4.80	4.01	4.02	4.31	4.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 20
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 24 Non-major 4
84-150	13	3.00-3.49 3	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 20	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ART 431 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN VII
 Instructor: COATES, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 119
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	2	1	6	12	4.33	814/1522	4.33	4.39	4.30	4.42	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	1	1	1	6	12	4.29	844/1522	4.29	4.30	4.26	4.34	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	15	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1285	****	4.41	4.30	4.42	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	1	2	2	1	5	10	3.95	1068/1476	3.95	4.30	4.22	4.31	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	15	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	****/1412	****	3.93	4.06	4.11	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	18	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1381	****	3.61	4.08	4.21	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	2	6	1	11	3.90	1088/1500	3.90	4.01	4.18	4.25	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	11	10	4.48	1104/1517	4.48	4.56	4.65	4.71	4.48	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	807/1497	4.13	4.15	4.11	4.21	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	1007/1440	4.30	4.46	4.45	4.52	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	629/1448	4.85	4.81	4.71	4.75	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	825/1436	4.30	4.40	4.29	4.32	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	4	4	10	4.05	1013/1432	4.05	4.38	4.29	4.34	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	2	1	4	3	5	3.53	887/1221	3.53	4.39	3.93	4.04	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	515/1280	4.35	4.10	4.10	4.28	4.35	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	1	6	7	4.06	913/1277	4.06	4.48	4.34	4.50	4.06	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	1	0	6	9	4.24	791/1269	4.24	4.46	4.31	4.49	4.24	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	9	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	402/ 854	4.13	4.01	4.02	4.31	4.13	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 21
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 26 Non-major 5
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 5	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 20	
			? 2		

Course-Section: ART 447 0101
 Title 2D ANIMATION/COMPOSITI
 Instructor: MALDONADO, JORG
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 120
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	5	4.38	767/1522	4.38	4.39	4.30	4.42	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	874/1522	4.25	4.30	4.26	4.34	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	****	4.41	4.30	4.42	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	703/1476	4.33	4.30	4.22	4.31	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1327/1412	3.00	3.93	4.06	4.11	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	0	0	3	2	3.43	1345/1500	3.43	4.01	4.18	4.25	3.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.00	4.56	4.65	4.71	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	385/1497	4.50	4.15	4.11	4.21	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	1023/1440	4.29	4.46	4.45	4.52	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	1332/1448	4.14	4.81	4.71	4.75	4.14	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1177/1436	3.86	4.40	4.29	4.32	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	862/1432	4.29	4.38	4.29	4.34	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	343/1221	4.43	4.39	3.93	4.04	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	1270/1280	2.20	4.10	4.10	4.28	2.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	1265/1277	2.60	4.48	4.34	4.50	2.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	3	0	0	2	3.20	1187/1269	3.20	4.46	4.31	4.49	3.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	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	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 460 0101
 Title INSTALLATION ART
 Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 121
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	6	5	4.33	814/1522	4.33	4.39	4.30	4.42	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	358/1522	4.67	4.30	4.26	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1285	****	4.41	4.30	4.42	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.30	4.22	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	646/1412	4.17	3.93	4.06	4.11	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	938/1381	3.91	3.61	4.08	4.21	3.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	312/1500	4.67	4.01	4.18	4.25	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1011/1517	4.58	4.56	4.65	4.71	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	807/1497	4.13	4.15	4.11	4.21	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	512/1440	4.73	4.46	4.45	4.52	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.81	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	341/1436	4.73	4.40	4.29	4.32	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	280/1432	4.82	4.38	4.29	4.34	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	96/1221	4.82	4.39	3.93	4.04	4.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	324/1280	4.60	4.10	4.10	4.28	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	254/1277	4.88	4.48	4.34	4.50	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	361/1269	4.78	4.46	4.31	4.49	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 854	****	4.01	4.02	4.31	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 1		

Course-Section: ART 484 0201
 Title ADVANCED 3D ANIMATION
 Instructor: BAILEY, DAN
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 122
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	190/1522	4.88	4.39	4.30	4.42	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	310/1522	4.71	4.30	4.26	4.34	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	366/1285	4.67	4.41	4.30	4.42	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	613/1476	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.31	4.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	760/1412	4.00	3.93	4.06	4.11	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1381	****	3.61	4.08	4.21	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	483/1500	4.50	4.01	4.18	4.25	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	784/1517	4.76	4.56	4.65	4.71	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	240/1497	4.69	4.15	4.11	4.21	4.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	532/1440	4.71	4.46	4.45	4.52	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	802/1448	4.79	4.81	4.71	4.75	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	514/1436	4.57	4.40	4.29	4.32	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	129/1432	4.93	4.38	4.29	4.34	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	61/1221	4.93	4.39	3.93	4.04	4.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	390/1280	4.50	4.10	4.10	4.28	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	594/1277	4.50	4.48	4.34	4.50	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.46	4.31	4.49	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 7		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 489A 0101
 Title
 Instructor: DURANT, MARK
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 123
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	7	4.88	197/1522	4.88	4.39	4.30	4.42	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	874/1522	4.25	4.30	4.26	4.34	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	****	4.41	4.30	4.42	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.30	4.22	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	2	4	4.00	760/1412	4.00	3.93	4.06	4.11	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	806/1381	4.00	3.61	4.08	4.21	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1272/1500	3.57	4.01	4.18	4.25	3.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	555/1517	4.88	4.56	4.65	4.71	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	223/1497	4.71	4.15	4.11	4.21	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	304/1440	4.83	4.46	4.45	4.52	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.81	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	188/1436	4.83	4.40	4.29	4.32	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	254/1432	4.83	4.38	4.29	4.34	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.39	3.93	4.04	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	184/1280	4.80	4.10	4.10	4.28	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.48	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.46	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.01	4.02	4.31	****	

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 0		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	9
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	8

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 489B 0101
 Title
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 124
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	970/1522	4.18	4.39	4.30	4.42	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	1080/1522	4.00	4.30	4.26	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	2	2	3	3.30	1214/1285	3.30	4.41	4.30	4.42	3.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.30	4.22	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	964/1412	3.82	3.93	4.06	4.11	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	1097/1381	3.67	3.61	4.08	4.21	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	940/1500	4.09	4.01	4.18	4.25	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	1193/1517	4.36	4.56	4.65	4.71	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	240/1497	4.70	4.15	4.11	4.21	4.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	682/1440	4.60	4.46	4.45	4.52	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	765/1448	4.80	4.81	4.71	4.75	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	601/1436	4.50	4.40	4.29	4.32	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	758/1432	4.40	4.38	4.29	4.34	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	279/1221	4.50	4.39	3.93	4.04	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	530/1280	4.33	4.10	4.10	4.28	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	560/1277	4.56	4.48	4.34	4.50	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	361/1269	4.78	4.46	4.31	4.49	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	380/ 854	4.17	4.01	4.02	4.31	4.17	

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 5		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 489C 0101
 Title
 Instructor: DYER, ERIC G
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 125
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	5	3	2	3.15	1476/1522	3.15	4.39	4.30	4.42	3.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	2	4	3.38	1408/1522	3.38	4.30	4.26	4.34	3.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	4	3	1	2	2.75	1268/1285	2.75	4.41	4.30	4.42	2.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	0	3	2	3	3.00	1416/1476	3.00	4.30	4.22	4.31	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	4	1	2	2.69	1373/1412	2.69	3.93	4.06	4.11	2.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	2	2	1	2	2.70	1345/1381	2.70	3.61	4.08	4.21	2.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	6	3	3.77	1175/1500	3.77	4.01	4.18	4.25	3.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	691/1517	4.82	4.56	4.65	4.71	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1227/1497	3.63	4.15	4.11	4.21	3.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	0	0	4	5	3.91	1252/1440	3.91	4.46	4.45	4.52	3.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	1284/1448	4.30	4.81	4.71	4.75	4.30	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	3	0	6	4.00	1056/1436	4.00	4.40	4.29	4.32	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	0	2	5	3.80	1170/1432	3.80	4.38	4.29	4.34	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	156/1221	4.70	4.39	3.93	4.04	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	894/1280	3.78	4.10	4.10	4.28	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	652/1277	4.44	4.48	4.34	4.50	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	848/1269	4.11	4.46	4.31	4.49	4.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	673/ 854	3.50	4.01	4.02	4.31	3.50	

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 13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 13 Non-major 0
84-150	5	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	
			? 2		

Course-Section: ART 495 0125
 Title INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH
 Instructor: PEREGOY, CHRIST
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 126
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	3	5.00	1/1522	4.75	4.39	4.30	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.41	4.30	4.42	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1416/1476	4.50	4.30	4.22	4.31	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	231/1412	4.89	3.93	4.06	4.11	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.01	4.18	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.56	4.65	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1497	4.89	4.15	4.11	4.21	4.67

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 1		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	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	1
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 495 0143
 Title INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 127
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	5.00	1/1522	4.75	4.39	4.30	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.41	4.30	4.42	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1476	4.50	4.30	4.22	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1412	4.89	3.93	4.06	4.11	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1381	4.67	3.61	4.08	4.21	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.01	4.18	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.56	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1497	4.89	4.15	4.11	4.21	5.00	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.46	4.45	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.81	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.38	4.29	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.39	3.93	4.04	5.00	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.10	4.10	4.28	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.48	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.46	4.31	4.49	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	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		Non-major
			I 0		
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 495 0145
 Title INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 128
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	0	4.00	1122/1522	4.75	4.39	4.30	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.34	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	4.50	4.30	4.22	4.31	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	806/1381	4.67	3.61	4.08	4.21	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.56	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1497	4.89	4.15	4.11	4.21	5.00	

Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.51	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	5.00	4.30	4.22	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.40	4.03	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	23/ 35	4.50	4.50	4.31	4.13	4.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	5.00	4.30	4.11	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	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		Non-major
			I 0		0
			? 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				Other	1

Course-Section: ART 495 0149
 Title INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH
 Instructor: DYER, ERIC G
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 129
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1/1522	4.75	4.39	4.30	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.41	4.30	4.42	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	4.50	4.30	4.22	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1412	4.89	3.93	4.06	4.11	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1381	4.67	3.61	4.08	4.21	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.01	4.18	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.56	4.65	4.71	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.46	4.45	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.81	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.38	4.29	4.34	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.10	4.10	4.28	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.48	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.46	4.31	4.49	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.51	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	5.00	4.30	4.22	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.40	4.03	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	4.50	4.50	4.31	4.13	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	5.00	4.30	4.11	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 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	0
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 624 0101
 Title ART & CRIT
 Instructor: JACOB, PREMINDA
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 130
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	8	4.67	433/1522	4.67	4.39	4.30	4.45	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	358/1522	4.67	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	173/1285	4.88	4.41	4.30	4.31	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	172/1476	4.82	4.30	4.22	4.31	4.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	167/1412	4.75	3.93	4.06	4.25	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	263/1381	4.58	3.61	4.08	4.25	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	312/1500	4.67	4.01	4.18	4.22	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1011/1517	4.58	4.56	4.65	4.73	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	385/1497	4.50	4.15	4.11	4.21	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	304/1440	4.83	4.46	4.45	4.48	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	444/1448	4.92	4.81	4.71	4.80	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	295/1436	4.75	4.40	4.29	4.37	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	548/1432	4.58	4.38	4.29	4.33	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	77/1221	4.91	4.39	3.93	3.83	4.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	468/1280	4.42	4.10	4.10	4.24	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	540/1277	4.58	4.48	4.34	4.52	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	381/1269	4.75	4.46	4.31	4.51	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	84/ 854	4.83	4.01	4.02	4.08	4.83	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.36	4.72	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	5.00	4.35	4.39	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.51	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	5.00	4.42	4.76	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.40	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.76	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.70	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	28/ 65	4.88	4.97	4.49	4.71	4.88	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	30/ 78	4.88	4.84	4.45	4.66	4.88	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.38	4.11	4.38	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.41	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.30	4.49	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.40	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.71	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.30	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.63	4.82	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.68	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.79	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.83	****	

Course-Section: ART 624 0101
 Title ART & CRIT
 Instructor: JACOB, PREMINDA
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 130
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	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	6	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 630 0101
 Title TECH. SEMINAR
 Instructor: REINSEL, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 131
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.29	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.30	4.22	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1412	5.00	3.93	4.06	4.25	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.01	4.18	4.22	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.56	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.15	4.11	4.21	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1186/1440	4.00	4.46	4.45	4.48	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.81	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.38	4.29	4.33	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.39	3.93	3.83	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.10	4.10	4.24	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.48	4.34	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.46	4.31	4.51	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.01	4.02	4.08	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.76	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.70	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 65	5.00	4.97	4.49	4.71	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	4.84	4.45	4.66	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	49/ 80	4.00	4.38	4.11	4.38	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	1
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	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	2	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 640 0101
 Title IMAGING & DIGITAL STUD
 Instructor: DURANT, MARK
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 132
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	545/1522	4.50	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.30	4.22	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1412	5.00	3.93	4.06	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	331/1381	4.50	3.61	4.08	4.25	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.01	4.18	4.22	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.56	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	385/1497	4.50	4.15	4.11	4.21	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.46	4.45	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.81	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.38	4.29	4.33	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.39	3.93	3.83	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.10	4.10	4.24	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.48	4.34	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.46	4.31	4.51	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.01	4.02	4.08	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.76	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.70	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 65	5.00	4.97	4.49	4.71	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	49/ 78	4.50	4.84	4.45	4.66	4.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	62/ 80	3.50	4.38	4.11	4.38	3.50	

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 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 1
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	2

Course-Section: ART 649F 0101
 Title ADVANCED 3D ANIMATION
 Instructor: BAILEY, DAN
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 133
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1/1522	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.29	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1416/1476	3.00	4.30	4.22	4.31	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	760/1412	4.00	3.93	4.06	4.25	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.01	4.18	4.22	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.56	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.15	4.11	4.21	5.00	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1186/1440	4.00	4.46	4.45	4.48	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.81	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.38	4.29	4.33	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.39	3.93	3.83	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
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 740 0101
 Title ADV. I&D STUDIO
 Instructor: DURANT, MARK
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 134
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1/1522	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.29	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.41	4.30	4.31	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.30	4.22	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1412	5.00	3.93	4.06	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1381	5.00	3.61	4.08	4.25	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.01	4.18	4.22	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.56	4.65	4.73	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.46	4.45	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.81	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.38	4.29	4.33	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.39	3.93	3.83	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.10	4.10	4.24	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.48	4.34	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.46	4.31	4.51	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.01	4.02	4.08	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 215	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.72	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 228	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.39	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.61	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 216	5.00	5.00	4.42	4.76	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.76	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.70	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 65	5.00	4.97	4.49	4.71	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	4.84	4.45	4.66	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.38	4.11	4.38	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.40	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	5.00	4.30	4.49	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.40	4.78	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	5.00	4.30	4.82	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.63	4.82	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 23	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.68	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 33	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.79	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 22	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.83	5.00	

Course-Section: ART 740 0101
 Title ADV. I&D STUDIO
 Instructor: DURANT, MARK
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 134
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	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	0	Under-grad	0	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						