```
Course-Section: ART  210  0201          University of Maryland                              Page  105
Title       VISUAL CONCEPTS              Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    NOHE, TIM                 Fall   2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      15
Questionnaires:  10                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	508/1639	4.50	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	199/1639	4.42	4.38	4.22	4.27	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1397	4.63	4.50	4.28	4.39	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1583	4.69	4.50	4.19	4.28	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	335/1532	3.83	3.99	4.01	4.09	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1504	3.13	3.89	4.05	4.09	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	490/1612	4.22	4.05	4.16	4.21	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	811/1635	4.45	4.63	4.65	4.63	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	205/1579	4.35	4.26	4.08	4.14	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	257/1518	4.77	4.47	4.43	4.48	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1520	4.92	4.87	4.70	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	181/1517	4.61	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	351/1550	4.41	4.24	4.22	4.33	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1295	4.81	4.50	3.94	4.07	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	177/1398	4.54	4.27	4.07	4.14	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	393/1391	4.55	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1388	4.72	4.56	4.28	4.37	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	577/ 958	4.16	4.13	3.93	4.00	3.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 224	****	4.96	4.10	4.33	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	4.33	4.60	4.11	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 219	****	2.29	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.47	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.75	4.47	2.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.16	4.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	4.67	3.87	4.05	4.28	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	4.79	4.45	3.24	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	3.67	4.37	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****

```
Course-Section: ART  210  0201                    University of Maryland                          Page  105
Title          VISUAL CONCEPTS                       Baltimore County                           FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    NOHE, TIM                               Fall   2007                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    15
Questionnaires: 10                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                           Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned            Cum. GPA          Expected Grades              Reasons                    Type                      Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    3            0.00-0.99   0        A    5          Required for Majors  1        Graduate     0        Major       7
 28-55    1            1.00-1.99   0        B    4
 56-83    0            2.00-2.99   1        C    0          General              1        Under-grad  10        Non-major   3
 84-150   1            3.00-3.49   0        D    0
 Grad.    0            3.50-4.00   2        F    0          Electives            1        #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                         responses to be significant
                                           I    0          Other                7
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ART  210  0301               University of Maryland                                    Page  106
Title      VISUAL CONCEPTS                    Baltimore County                                         FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    CHAN, IRENE Y.                 Fall   2007                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    12
Questionnaires:  9                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   1   1   7  4.67   430/1639   4.50  4.45  4.27  4.35  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   1   3   4  4.11  1003/1639   4.42  4.38  4.22  4.27  4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   7   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/1397   4.63  4.50  4.28  4.39  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   1   7  4.67   323/1583   4.69  4.50  4.19  4.28  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   0   2   1   2   3   1  3.00  1421/1532   3.83  3.99  4.01  4.09  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0   0   3   0   3   1   2  2.89  1437/1504   3.13  3.89  4.05  4.09  2.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   1   0   1   4   3  3.89  1190/1612   4.22  4.05  4.16  4.21  3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   8   1  4.11  1447/1635   4.45  4.63  4.65  4.63  4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  4   0   0   0   0   3   2  4.40   496/1579   4.35  4.26  4.08  4.14  4.40

               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   1   8  4.89   242/1518   4.77  4.47  4.43  4.48  4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   1   8  4.89   597/1520   4.92  4.87  4.70  4.78  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  1   0   0   0   1   4   3  4.25   886/1517   4.61  4.43  4.27  4.34  4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0   0   2   2   4  4.25   897/1550   4.41  4.24  4.22  4.33  4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  1   1   0   0   1   2   4  4.43   329/1295   4.81  4.50  3.94  4.07  4.43

               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  0   0   0   0   1   3   5  4.44   477/1398   4.54  4.27  4.07  4.14  4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  0   0   0   1   1   2   5  4.22   839/1391   4.55  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  0   0   0   0   2   1   6  4.44   702/1388   4.72  4.56  4.28  4.37  4.44
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   7   0   0   0   0   2  5.00  ****/ 958   4.16  4.13  3.93  4.00  ****

               Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information  6   0   0   0   0   2   1  4.33   115/ 240   4.33  4.60  4.11  4.47  4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  6   1   0   0   1   1   0  3.50  ****/ 219   ****  2.29  4.44  4.61  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           6   2   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/ 215   ****  ****  4.35  4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  6   2   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 198   ****  ****  4.18  4.08  ****

               Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  6   2   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  85   ****  4.75  4.58  4.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  6   1   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/  82   ****  5.00  4.52  3.00  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  6   1   0   0   1   1   0  3.50  ****/  78   ****  4.83  4.47  ****  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    6   1   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/  80   ****  4.75  4.47  2.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                6   1   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/  82   ****  4.63  4.16  4.00  ****

               Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  7   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00  ****/  52   ****  4.67  4.04  4.78  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  6   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67    16/  53   4.67  3.87  4.05  4.28  4.67
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       6   1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00  ****/  42   ****  5.00  4.75  ****  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   7   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00  ****/  37   ****  5.00  4.58  ****  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  7   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/  32   ****  4.50  4.56  ****  ****

               Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  7   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/  50   ****  4.79  4.45  3.24  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    7   1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  32   ****  5.00  4.51  4.33  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      7   0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50  ****/  43   ****  5.00  4.69  ****  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       7   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/  32   ****  3.67  4.37  1.00  ****
```

                                                Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ART  210  0401              University of Maryland                          Page  107
Title       VISUAL CONCEPTS                   Baltimore County                            FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    BELL, KATHRYN L                    Fall   2007                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     32
Questionnaires: 27                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   3   7  17  4.52  604/1639  4.50  4.45  4.27  4.35  4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   4   7  15  4.33  774/1639  4.42  4.38  4.22  4.27  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2  17   0   0   1   2   5  4.50  517/1397  4.63  4.50  4.28  4.39  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   1   2   9  14  4.38  625/1583  4.69  4.50  4.19  4.28  4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  18   0   1   1   3   3  4.00  774/1532  3.83  3.99  4.01  4.09  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1   2   3   3   7   5   6  3.33 1303/1504  3.13  3.89  4.05  4.09  3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   0   6   7  13  4.27  802/1612  4.22  4.05  4.16  4.21  4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   1  25   0  3.96 1525/1635  4.45  4.63  4.65  4.63  3.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11   0   0   0   3   8   5  4.13  806/1579  4.35  4.26  4.08  4.14  4.13


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0   1   0   7  17  4.60  684/1518  4.77  4.47  4.43  4.48  4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   0   1   0  24  4.92  437/1520  4.92  4.87  4.70  4.78  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0   0   0   1   8  16  4.60  474/1517  4.61  4.43  4.27  4.34  4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   2   0   0   8  15  4.36  805/1550  4.41  4.24  4.22  4.33  4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3   1   0   0   1   2  20  4.83  103/1295  4.81  4.50  3.94  4.07  4.83


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0   0   0   2   5  14  4.57  386/1398  4.54  4.27  4.07  4.14  4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0   0   0   0   4  17  4.81  332/1391  4.55  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6   0   0   1   0   2  18  4.76  375/1388  4.72  4.56  4.28  4.37  4.76
4. Were special techniques successful                  6   9   0   0   1   5   6  4.42  260/ 958  4.16  4.13  3.93  4.00  4.42

                 Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 26   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  32  ****  4.50  4.56  ****  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                   Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     2       0.00-0.99    1       A   11        Required for Majors   0    Graduate       0      Major        10
 28-55     4       1.00-1.99    0       B   11
 56-83     2       2.00-2.99    1       C    0        General               2    Under-grad    27      Non-major    17
 84-150    0       3.00-3.49    2       D    0
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    1       F    0        Electives             2    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other                19
                                        ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ART  211  0101             University of Maryland                               Page  108
Title        VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM        Baltimore County                                     FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  THOMPSON, CALLA               Fall   2007                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     34
Questionnaires: 29                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                 Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0  0  0  0  4  24  4.86  214/1639  4.70  4.45  4.27  4.35  4.86
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  7  21  4.75  252/1639  4.69  4.38  4.22  4.27  4.75
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   4  0  0  1  5  18  4.71  334/1397  4.85  4.50  4.28  4.39  4.71
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  0  1  5  22  4.75  239/1583  4.85  4.50  4.19  4.28  4.75
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  3  6  5  12  4.00  774/1532  3.84  3.99  4.01  4.09  4.00
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 3 0 5 4 2 12  3.91  932/1504  3.74  3.89  4.05  4.09  3.91
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained           3   0  0  0  2  7  17  4.58  418/1612  4.44  4.05  4.16  4.21  4.58
 8. How many times was class cancelled                 3   0  0  0  0 16  10  4.38 1250/1635  4.54  4.63  4.65  4.63  4.38
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 2 0 0 1 4 17 4.73 197/1579  4.46  4.26  4.08  4.14  4.73


              Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2   0  0  0  1  6  20  4.70  548/1518  4.84  4.47  4.43  4.48  4.70
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2   0  0  0  0  1  26  4.96  219/1520  4.97  4.87  4.70  4.78  4.96
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 2 3 22  4.74  311/1517  4.78  4.43  4.27  4.34  4.74
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2   0  1  1  0  7  18  4.48  664/1550  4.53  4.24  4.22  4.33  4.48
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 2 5 20 4.67 185/1295  4.50  4.50  3.94  4.07  4.67


              Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 1 4 19  4.75  260/1398  4.63  4.27  4.07  4.14  4.75
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 1 6 17  4.67  489/1391  4.68  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.67
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 2 22 4.92 201/1388  4.72  4.56  4.28  4.37  4.92
 4. Were special techniques successful                 5   8  0  0  4  2  10  4.38  284/ 958  4.09  4.13  3.93  4.00  4.38


              Laboratory
 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 21  0  0  0  0  1   7  4.88   21/ 224  4.88  4.96  4.10  4.33  4.88
 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 21 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88  25/ 240  4.88  4.60  4.11  4.47  4.88
 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 21 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 39/ 219  4.88  2.29  4.44  4.61  4.88
 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          21  1  0  0  0  1   6  4.86 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.43  ****
 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 21 2 0 0 0 0 6  5.00 ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.18  4.08  ****


              Seminar
 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21 1 0 0 0 0 7  5.00 ****/  85  ****  4.75  4.58  4.00  ****
 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 1 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 ****/  82  ****  5.00  4.52  3.00  ****
 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21 2 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 ****/  78  ****  4.83  4.47  ****  ****
 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   21  1  0  0  0  0   7  5.00 ****/  80  ****  4.75  4.47  2.00  ****
 5. Were criteria for grading made clear               21  1  0  0  0  0   7  5.00 ****/  82  ****  4.63  4.16  4.00  ****


              Field Work
 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 20 0 1 0 0 2 6  4.33   31/  52  4.33  4.67  4.04  4.78  4.33
 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 20 0 1 0 0 1 7  4.44   23/  53  4.44  3.87  4.05  4.28  4.44
 3. Was the instructor available for consultation      20  2  0  0  0  1   6  4.86 ****/  42  ****  5.00  4.75  ****  ****
 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  21  1  0  0  0  0   7  5.00 ****/  37  ****  5.00  4.58  ****  ****
 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 21 3 0 0 0 0 5  5.00 ****/  32  ****  4.50  4.56  ****  ****


              Self  Paced
 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 1 0 0 1 6 4.38  34/  50  4.38  4.79  4.45  3.24  4.38
 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   21  3  0  0  0  0   5  5.00 ****/  32  ****  5.00  4.51  4.33  ****
 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     21  2  0  0  0  1   5  4.83 ****/  43  ****  5.00  4.69  ****  ****
 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      21  3  0  0  0  0   5  5.00 ****/  32  ****  3.67  4.37  1.00  ****
 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    21  3  0  0  0  0   5  5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  3.00  ****
```

Enrollment: 34
Questionnaires: 29   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   3   0.00-0.99   1   A   18   Required for Majors   0   Graduate   0   Major   18
 28-55   2   1.00-1.99   0   B   5
 56-83   3   2.00-2.99   0   C   0   General   1   Under-grad   29   Non-major   11
 84-150   0   3.00-3.49   3   D   0
 Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   2   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P   0   responses to be significant
                                           I   0   Other   23
                                           ?   1

```
Course-Section: ART  211  0301            University of Maryland                              Page  109
Title        VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM       Baltimore County                                  FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  SILBERG, STEVEN              Fall   2007                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     14
Questionnaires:  10                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   1   0   1   8  4.60   508/1639  4.70  4.45  4.27  4.35  4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   1   0   3   6  4.40   684/1639  4.69  4.38  4.22  4.27  4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   0   0   1   8  4.89   175/1397  4.85  4.50  4.28  4.39  4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0   0   1   1   8  4.70   299/1583  4.85  4.50  4.19  4.28  4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   4   3   3  3.90   911/1532  3.84  3.99  4.01  4.09  3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0   3   3   2   2     3.30  1323/1504  3.74  3.89  4.05  4.09  3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   1   1   4   4  4.10   976/1612  4.44  4.05  4.16  4.21  4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0   2   7  4.78   855/1635  4.54  4.63  4.65  4.63  4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0   0   1   3   4  4.38   527/1579  4.46  4.26  4.08  4.14  4.38

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   0   0   2   7  4.78   416/1518  4.84  4.47  4.43  4.48  4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   1   9  4.90   546/1520  4.97  4.87  4.70  4.78  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   0   0   2   7  4.78   275/1517  4.78  4.43  4.27  4.34  4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0   1   0   1   7  4.56   580/1550  4.53  4.24  4.22  4.33  4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0   1   0   2   1   6  4.10   577/1295  4.50  4.50  3.94  4.07  4.10

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0   1   0   0   3   5  4.22   651/1398  4.63  4.27  4.07  4.14  4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0   0   0   2   1   6  4.44   662/1391  4.68  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0   0   0   2   1   6  4.44   702/1388  4.72  4.56  4.28  4.37  4.44
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   5   1   0   1   1   1  3.25   806/ 958  4.09  4.13  3.93  4.00  3.25

                                   Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ART  211  0401                University of Maryland                                    Page  110
Title       VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM            Baltimore County                                         FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   SAAH, CHRIS                     Fall   2007                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     12
Questionnaires:  8                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  1  1  6 4.63  482/1639  4.70  4.45  4.27 4.35  4.63
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  2  6 4.75  252/1639  4.69  4.38  4.22 4.27  4.75
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   4  0  0  0  0  3 5.00    1/1397  4.85  4.50  4.28 4.39  5.00
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  0  8 5.00    1/1583  4.85  4.50  4.19 4.28  5.00
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  2  0  2  1  3 3.38 1312/1532  3.84  3.99  4.01 4.09  3.38
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 1  0  1  2  2 3.67 1116/1504  3.74  3.89  4.05 4.09  3.67
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   2  0  0  0  3  3 4.50  490/1612  4.44  4.05  4.16 4.21  4.50
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  6  1 4.14 1428/1635  4.54  4.63  4.65 4.63  4.14
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0  0  1  3  1 4.00  889/1579  4.46  4.26  4.08 4.14  4.00


               Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  1  7 4.88  257/1518  4.84  4.47  4.43 4.48  4.88
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  0  8 5.00    1/1520  4.97  4.87  4.70 4.78  5.00
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  1  7 4.88  181/1517  4.78  4.43  4.27 4.34  4.88
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  1  0  0  0  7 4.50  638/1550  4.53  4.24  4.22 4.33  4.50
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0  0  0  0  7 5.00    1/1295  4.50  4.50  3.94 4.07  5.00


               Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  1  6 4.86  189/1398  4.63  4.27  4.07 4.14  4.86
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  1  0  6 4.71  441/1391  4.68  4.52  4.30 4.35  4.71
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0  0  1  0  6 4.71  435/1388  4.72  4.56  4.28 4.37  4.71
 4. Were special techniques successful                  1   4  0  0  1  0  2 4.33  307/ 958  4.09  4.13  3.93 4.00  4.33


               Laboratory
 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  7   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 224  4.88  4.96  4.10 4.33  ****
 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 0 0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 240  4.88  4.60  4.11 4.47  ****
 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0 0 0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 219  4.88  2.29  4.44 4.61  ****
 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           7   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35 4.43  ****
 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 7   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.18 4.08  ****


               Seminar
 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 7  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  85  ****  4.75  4.58 4.00  ****
 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 7 0 0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  82  ****  5.00  4.52 3.00  ****
 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  78  ****  4.83  4.47 **** ****
 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    7   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  80  ****  4.75  4.47 2.00  ****
 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                7   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  82  ****  4.63  4.16 4.00  ****


               Field Work
 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  52  4.33  4.67  4.04 4.78  ****
 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  7   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  53  4.44  3.87  4.05 4.28  ****
 3. Was the instructor available for consultation        7   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  42  ****  5.00  4.75 **** ****
 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    7   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  37  ****  5.00  4.58 **** ****
 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  7   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  32  ****  4.50  4.56 **** ****


               Self  Paced
 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  50  4.38  4.79  4.45 3.24  ****
 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     7   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  32  ****  5.00  4.51 4.33  ****
 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       7   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  43  ****  5.00  4.69 **** ****
 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        7   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  32  ****  3.67  4.37 1.00  ****
 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      7   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52 3.00  ****
```

```
Course-Section: ART  211  0401              University of Maryland                        Page  110
Title        VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM         Baltimore County                             FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  SAAH, CHRIS                    Fall   2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     12
Questionnaires:  8                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                     Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: ART  211   0501              University of Maryland                              Page  111
Title          VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM          Baltimore County                                 FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    SILBERG, STEVEN                   Fall   2007                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       15
Questionnaires:   15                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies           Instructor     Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank      Mean  Mean   Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  1  2 12  4.73  342/1639   4.70  4.45   4.27  4.35  4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  2 13  4.87  156/1639   4.69  4.38   4.22  4.27  4.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  1 13  4.80  230/1397   4.85  4.50   4.28  4.39  4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  1 14  4.93  100/1583   4.85  4.50   4.19  4.28  4.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  1  3  5  6  4.07  729/1532   3.84  3.99   4.01  4.09  4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  4  3  7  4.07  791/1504   3.74  3.89   4.05  4.09  4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  6  9  4.60  388/1612   4.44  4.05   4.16  4.21  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  2 13  4.87  721/1635   4.54  4.63   4.65  4.63  4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  0  0  0  0  3  9  4.75  175/1579   4.46  4.26   4.08  4.14  4.75


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  0 15  5.00    1/1518   4.84  4.47   4.43  4.48  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  0 15  5.00    1/1520   4.97  4.87   4.70  4.78  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  4 11  4.73  323/1517   4.78  4.43   4.27  4.34  4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  1  4 10  4.60  522/1550   4.53  4.24   4.22  4.33  4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  1  0  1  2  4  7  4.21  489/1295   4.50  4.50   3.94  4.07  4.21


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70  309/1398   4.63  4.27   4.07  4.14  4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  227/1391   4.68  4.52   4.30  4.35  4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  328/1388   4.72  4.56   4.28  4.37  4.80
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   5  0  0  0  3  2  4.40  267/ 958   4.09  4.13   3.93  4.00  4.40

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  14   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 224   4.88  4.96   4.10  4.33  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 240   4.88  4.60   4.11  4.47  ****


                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      5       0.00-0.99    0        A    4      Required for Majors   1    Graduate      0      Major        11
28-55      3       1.00-1.99    0        B    8                                                                  
56-83      4       2.00-2.99    2        C    0      General               1    Under-grad   15      Non-major     4
84-150     0       3.00-3.49    3        D    0
Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    4        F    0      Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other                10
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ART  212  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  112
Title       VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D          Baltimore County                                 FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  BRADLEY, STEPHE                    Fall   2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     16
Questionnaires: 13                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                 NR  NA   1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank  Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   1  0  5  6  1  3.46 1510/1639  3.86  4.45  4.27  4.35  3.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   1  4  2  2  4  3.31 1542/1639  3.78  4.38  4.22  4.27  3.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  11   0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/1397  ****  4.50  4.28  4.39  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   1   0  2  2  3  4  3.82 1219/1583  4.00  4.50  4.19  4.28  3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   9   0  1  0  2  1  3.75 1046/1532  3.58  3.99  4.01  4.09  3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  2   2  3  3  2  1  2.73 1465/1504  2.72  3.89  4.05  4.09  2.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0  2  4  5  2  3.54 1387/1612  3.47  4.05  4.16  4.21  3.54
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0  0  0  1 12  4.92  529/1635  4.90  4.63  4.65  4.63  4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0   1  2  4  4  0  3.00 1477/1579  3.58  4.26  4.08  4.14  3.00


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0  0  3  6  4  4.08 1213/1518  4.26  4.47  4.43  4.48  4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0  1  0  2 10  4.62 1101/1520  4.78  4.87  4.70  4.78  4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   1  1  5  3  3  3.46 1361/1517  4.09  4.43  4.27  4.34  3.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   1  1  4  4  3  3.54 1318/1550  3.96  4.24  4.22  4.33  3.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0   0  1  3  4  5  4.00  623/1295  4.11  4.50  3.94  4.07  4.00


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0   0  2  2  4  3  3.73  987/1398  3.86  4.27  4.07  4.14  3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0   0  0  0  2  9  4.82  321/1391  4.50  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0   0  2  0  3  6  4.18  877/1388  4.42  4.56  4.28  4.37  4.18
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   5   0  0  4  1  1  3.50  725/ 958  3.54  4.13  3.93  4.00  3.50


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

```
Course-Section: ART  212  0201              University of Maryland                                Page  113
Title          VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D        Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    SHIFLET, NICOLE               Fall   2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     16
Questionnaires: 10                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  1  0  1  2  6  4.20  951/1639  3.86  4.45  4.27  4.35  4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  1  2  2  5  4.10 1014/1639  3.78  4.38  4.22  4.27  4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   9  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1397  ****  4.50  4.28  4.39  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  3  1  6  4.30  741/1583  4.00  4.50  4.19  4.28  4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 9  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1532  3.58  3.99  4.01  4.09  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   1  0  2  3  2  2  3.44 1424/1612  3.47  4.05  4.16  4.21  3.44
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1635  4.90  4.63  4.65  4.63  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0  1  5  1  4.00  889/1579  3.58  4.26  4.08  4.14  4.00


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70  561/1518  4.26  4.47  4.43  4.48  4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1520  4.78  4.87  4.70  4.78  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  239/1517  4.09  4.43  4.27  4.34  4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  1  0  1  8  4.60  522/1550  3.96  4.24  4.22  4.33  4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 1  0  1  8  4.60  221/1295  4.11  4.50  3.94  4.07  4.60


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0  0  1  0  1  6  4.50  426/1398  3.86  4.27  4.07  4.14  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1391  4.50  4.52  4.30  4.35  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1388  4.42  4.56  4.28  4.37  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 2   5  0  0  1  1  1  4.00  456/ 958  3.54  4.13  3.93  4.00  4.00


            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 9 0 0 0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 240  ****  4.60  4.11  4.47  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 1 0 0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 219  ****  2.29  4.44  4.61  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          8   1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.43  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 9 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  4.75  4.58  4.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 9 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  5.00  4.52  3.00  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   9   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  4.75  4.47  2.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               9   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  4.63  4.16  4.00  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  52  ****  4.67  4.04  4.78  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 9 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  53  ****  3.87  4.05  4.28  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  9   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  37  ****  5.00  4.58  ****  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  50  ****  4.79  4.45  3.24  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   9   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  5.00  4.51  4.33  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     9   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  43  ****  5.00  4.69  ****  ****


                               Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                   Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0      A   6      Required for Majors  0      Graduate      0        Major       10
28-55      1        1.00-1.99    0      B   3
56-83      2        2.00-2.99    0      C   1      General              0      Under-grad   10        Non-major    0
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
                                        P   0                                 responses to be significant
```

```
I    0              Other              10
?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ART  212  0301              University of Maryland                                    Page  114
Title        VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D         Baltimore County                                         FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  SHEFFIELD, SAM                 Fall   2007                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      16
Questionnaires:  15                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean   Mean Mean   Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  1  8  6  4.33  814/1639  3.86  4.45  4.27  4.35  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  8  6  4.33  774/1639  3.78  4.38  4.22  4.27  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  14  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1397  ****  4.50  4.28  4.39  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  1  1  0  5  8  4.20  852/1583  4.00  4.50  4.19  4.28  4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  1  1  1  8  3  3.79 1012/1532  3.58  3.99  4.01  4.09  3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  3  1  1  5  3  2  3.33 1303/1504  2.72  3.89  4.05  4.09  3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  1  7  4  2  3.33 1455/1612  3.47  4.05  4.16  4.21  3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  5 10  4.67 1001/1635  4.90  4.63  4.65  4.63  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0  0  0  0  9  4  4.31  601/1579  3.58  4.26  4.08  4.14  4.31


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  0  1 12  4.92  170/1518  4.26  4.47  4.43  4.48  4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  0  0 13  5.00    1/1520  4.78  4.87  4.70  4.78  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  0  5  8  4.62  462/1517  4.09  4.43  4.27  4.34  4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  0  0  1  4  8  4.54  603/1550  3.96  4.24  4.22  4.33  4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0  1  0  0  0 12  4.69  167/1295  4.11  4.50  3.94  4.07  4.69


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  2  7  5  4.21  660/1398  3.86  4.27  4.07  4.14  4.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  0  3 11  4.79  356/1391  4.50  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  1  2 11  4.71  435/1388  4.42  4.56  4.28  4.37  4.71
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   5  0  0  1  4  4  4.33  307/ 958  3.54  4.13  3.93  4.00  4.33


                                        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        14
  28-55     6         1.00-1.99    0        B   4                                        Under-grad   15        Non-major     1
  56-83     4         2.00-2.99    0        C   0          General               0
  84-150    0         3.00-3.49    1        D   0                                        #### - Means there are not enough
  Grad.     0         3.50-4.00    7        F   0          Electives             0              responses to be significant
                                            P   0
                                            I   0          Other                14
                                            ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ART  212  0401              University of Maryland                                    Page 115
Title       VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D            Baltimore County                                        FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: YOUNG, SHANNON                    Fall   2007                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     13
Questionnaires: 11                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  4  1  3  3  3.45 1513/1639  3.86  4.45  4.27 4.35  3.45
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  2  4  4  1  3.36 1530/1639  3.78  4.38  4.22 4.27  3.36
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2  1  1  1  3  3  3.67 1324/1583  4.00  4.50  4.19 4.28  3.67
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   6  1  1  0  2  1  3.20 1378/1532  3.58  3.99  4.01 4.09  3.20
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  6  0  2  1  1  2.10 1493/1504  2.72  3.89  4.05 4.09  2.10
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  1  1  3  3  3  3.55 1383/1612  3.47  4.05  4.16 4.21  3.55
 8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1635  4.90  4.63  4.65 4.63  5.00
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  2  4  2  0  3.00 1477/1579  3.58  4.26  4.08 4.14  3.00


                Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         5   0  1  1  1  1  2  3.33 1449/1518  4.26  4.47  4.43 4.48  3.33
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    5   0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50 1188/1520  4.78  4.87  4.70 4.78  4.50
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5   0  0  2  1  1  2  3.50 1347/1517  4.09  4.43  4.27 4.34  3.50
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      5   0  0  2  2  1  1  3.17 1419/1550  3.96  4.24  4.22 4.33  3.17
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  0  2  1  0  2  2  3.14 1138/1295  4.11  4.50  3.94 4.07  3.14


                Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0  1  1  1  1  1  3.00 1271/1398  3.86  4.27  4.07 4.14  3.00
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0  1  1  0  1  2  3.40 1247/1391  4.50  4.52  4.30 4.35  3.40
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  1  0  1  0  3  3.80 1078/1388  4.42  4.56  4.28 4.37  3.80
 4. Were special techniques successful                   6   2  2  0  0  0  1  2.33  931/ 958  3.54  4.13  3.93 4.00  2.33

                                        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     1      Major        8
 28-55      3       1.00-1.99    0        B    3
 56-83      2       2.00-2.99    1        C    0       General               0     Under-grad  10      Non-major    3
 84-150     1       3.00-3.49    1        D    0
 Grad.      1       3.50-4.00    3        F    0       Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                          I    0       Other                10
                                          ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ART  213  0101                    University of Maryland                                    Page  116
Title       VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D                     Baltimore County                                      FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   MOREN, LISA                                Fall   2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      30
Questionnaires:  28                            Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   3   0  0  0  1 12 12  4.44  698/1639  4.50  4.45  4.27  4.35  4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    3   0  0  1  3 13  8  4.12  992/1639  4.30  4.38  4.22  4.27  4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   3  22  0  0  0  3  0  4.00 ****/1397  ****  4.50  4.28  4.39  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    3   1  0  1  0 14  9  4.29  751/1583  4.34  4.50  4.19  4.28  4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4  9  2  1  3  6  3  3.47 1264/1532  3.66  3.99  4.01  4.09  3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 16 1 1 3  1  2  3.25 1340/1504  3.25  3.89  4.05  4.09  3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            4   0  2  2  7  8  5  3.50 1399/1612  3.58  4.05  4.16  4.21  3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  4   0  0  0  0  3 21  4.88  706/1635  4.88  4.63  4.65  4.63  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 4 15  5  4.04  865/1579  4.32  4.26  4.08  4.14  4.04


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        5   0  1  0  1 11 10  4.26 1085/1518  4.50  4.47  4.43  4.48  4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   5   0  0  0  0  2 21  4.91  491/1520  4.94  4.87  4.70  4.78  4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5  0  0  0  5 12  6  4.04 1059/1517  4.32  4.43  4.27  4.34  4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     5   0  1  2  6  4 10  3.87 1182/1550  4.27  4.24  4.22  4.33  3.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 2 1 1  0  7 12  4.33  398/1295  4.59  4.50  3.94  4.07  4.33


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 2  3  5  6  3.94  851/1398  4.13  4.27  4.07  4.14  3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 0 1  2  5  8  4.25  816/1391  4.44  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 0 1 1  4 10  4.44  712/1388  4.63  4.56  4.28  4.37  4.44
4. Were special techniques successful                  12   8  1  0  2  1  4  3.88  544/ 958  4.12  4.13  3.93  4.00  3.88


                 Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 26 0 0 0 0  2  0  4.00 ****/ 240  ****  4.60  4.11  4.47  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 25 1 0 0 0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 219  ****  2.29  4.44  4.61  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           26   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.43  ****


                 Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                27   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  82  ****  4.63  4.16  4.00  ****


                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 25 0 0 0 0  2  1  4.33 ****/  52  ****  4.67  4.04  4.78  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  25  0  0  0  1  2  0  3.67 ****/  53  ****  3.87  4.05  4.28  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        25  2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  5.00  4.75  ****  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    25  1  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/  37  ****  5.00  4.58  ****  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  25  1  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/  32  ****  4.50  4.56  ****  ****


                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 27 0 0 0 1  0  0  3.00 ****/  50  ****  4.79  4.45  3.24  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      27   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  43  ****  5.00  4.69  ****  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	24				

? 0

```
Course-Section: ART  213  0301             University of Maryland                                    Page  117
Title     VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D             Baltimore County                                         FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   NOHE, TIM                     Fall   2007                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    30
Questionnaires: 27                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   0   3   6  18  4.56  561/1639  4.50  4.45  4.27  4.35  4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   1   3   5  18  4.48  550/1639  4.30  4.38  4.22  4.27  4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1  24   0   0   0   0   2  5.00  ****/1397  ****  4.50  4.28  4.39  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1   0   0   4   8  14  4.38  625/1583  4.34  4.50  4.19  4.28  4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   7   2   0   5   5   8  3.85  950/1532  3.66  3.99  4.01  4.09  3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 21  1   1   2   0   1  2.80  ****/1504  3.25  3.89  4.05  4.09  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   1   2   0   9   9   6  3.65 1332/1612  3.58  4.05  4.16  4.21  3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1   0   0   0   3  23  4.88  691/1635  4.88  4.63  4.65  4.63  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0  0   0   1   7  14  4.59  292/1579  4.32  4.26  4.08  4.14  4.59

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   1   5  21  4.74  472/1518  4.50  4.47  4.43  4.48  4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   1  26  4.96  219/1520  4.94  4.87  4.70  4.78  4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   1   9  17  4.59  486/1517  4.32  4.43  4.27  4.34  4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   2   5  20  4.67  457/1550  4.27  4.24  4.22  4.33  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0  0   0   1   2  22  4.84   98/1295  4.59  4.50  3.94  4.07  4.84

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0   0   0   5   5  12  4.32  574/1398  4.13  4.27  4.07  4.14  4.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0   1   0   1   2  18  4.64  516/1391  4.44  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0  0   0   1   2  19  4.82  317/1388  4.63  4.56  4.28  4.37  4.82
4. Were special techniques successful                  5  11   0   0   2   3   6  4.36  290/ 958  4.12  4.13  3.93  4.00  4.36

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  26  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 224  ****  4.96  4.10  4.33  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 26 0 0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/ 240  ****  4.60  4.11  4.47  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 26  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  52  ****  4.67  4.04  4.78  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 26  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  53  ****  3.87  4.05  4.28  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       26  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  42  ****  5.00  4.75  ****  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                Type                Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    0        0.00-0.99    1      A   14        Required for Majors  1      Graduate     0       Major      22
 28-55    2        1.00-1.99    1      B    6
 56-83    2        2.00-2.99    1      C    2        General              0      Under-grad  27       Non-major   5
 84-150   6        3.00-3.49    2      D    0
 Grad.    0        3.50-4.00    9      F    0        Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                       I    0        Other               21
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ART  214  0101            University of Maryland                                     Page  118
Title       DRAWING I                     Baltimore County                                         FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  GARDNER, SYMMES                 Fall   2007                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     16
Questionnaires: 16                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                       Frequencies         Instructor     Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0   0   3   3  10  4.44   712/1639  4.44  4.45  4.27  4.35  4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   6  10  4.63   393/1639  4.63  4.38  4.22  4.27  4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  14   0   0   0   2   0  4.00  ****/1397  ****  4.50  4.28  4.39  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   1   0   0   1   4  10  4.60   371/1583  4.60  4.50  4.19  4.28  4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  3  1  3  2  4  3  3.38  1308/1532  3.38  3.99  4.01  4.09  3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 12  0  1  0  1  2  4.00   824/1504  4.00  3.89  4.05  4.09  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained          0   1   1   2   2   2   8  3.93  1135/1612  3.93  4.05  4.16  4.21  3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled                0   0   0   0   0  13   3  4.19  1402/1635  4.19  4.63  4.65  4.63  4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 9  5  4.36   548/1579  4.36  4.26  4.08  4.14  4.36

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared      3   0   0   0   1   6   6  4.38   968/1518  4.38  4.47  4.43  4.48  4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3   0   0   0   0   2  11  4.85   699/1520  4.85  4.87  4.70  4.78  4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0  0  0  1  4  8  4.54   560/1517  4.54  4.43  4.27  4.34  4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned   3   0   0   0   1   6   6  4.38   787/1550  4.38  4.24  4.22  4.33  4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 6  0  0  3  3  1  3.71   864/1295  3.71  4.50  3.94  4.07  3.71

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0  0  2  0  3  8  4.31   582/1398  4.31  4.27  4.07  4.14  4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 1 1 1 3 7  4.08   950/1391  4.08  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 1 0 2 3 7  4.15   892/1388  4.15  4.56  4.28  4.37  4.15
4. Were special techniques successful                3  10   0   0   2   1   0  3.33  ****/ 958  ****  4.13  3.93  4.00  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/  50  ****  4.79  4.45  3.24  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful    14   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/  43  ****  5.00  4.69  ****  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful     14   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  32  ****  3.67  4.37  1.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students   14   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  3.00  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned       Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type            Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      2       0.00-0.99   1       A   7        Required for Majors  0     Graduate     0      Major        6
28-55      1       1.00-1.99   0       B   5
56-83      1       2.00-2.99   1       C   0        General          5     Under-grad  16      Non-major   10
84-150     1       3.00-3.49   0       D   0
Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   1       F   0        Electives        0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0                              responses to be significant
                                       I   0        Other            7
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ART  215  0101              University of Maryland                                          Page  119
Title        INTRO TO ART & MEDIA            Baltimore County                                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   DURANT, MARK                   Fall   2007                                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   138
Questionnaires: 92                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                  NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0   5   5  14  24  43  4.04 1110/1639  4.04  4.45  4.27 4.35  4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   3   9  16  22  42  3.99 1124/1639  3.99  4.38  4.22 4.27  3.99
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  69   0   3   3   3  13  4.18 ****/1397  ****  4.50  4.28 4.39  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  17   3   3  19  16  34  4.00 1010/1583  4.00  4.50  4.19 4.28  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  15   1   5  11  18  40  4.21  616/1532  4.21  3.99  4.01 4.09  4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  2  2   6  11  21  48  4.22  647/1504  4.22  3.89  4.05 4.09  4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   2   2   7  12  22  46  4.16  924/1612  4.16  4.05  4.16 4.21  4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   3   0   1   0  10  77  4.85  736/1635  4.85  4.63  4.65 4.63  4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 17  5  2   2  12  29  25  4.04  865/1579  4.04  4.26  4.08 4.14  4.04


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   2   5  16  68  4.65  629/1518  4.65  4.47  4.43 4.48  4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   1   6   8  77  4.75  890/1520  4.75  4.87  4.70 4.78  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   1   2   7  15  66  4.57  510/1517  4.57  4.43  4.27 4.34  4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   1   3   2  11  13  61  4.41  755/1550  4.41  4.24  4.22 4.33  4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5  1  2   1   5   9  69  4.65  191/1295  4.65  4.50  3.94 4.07  4.65


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14  0  7   4  16  16  35  3.87  899/1398  3.87  4.27  4.07 4.14  3.87
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16  0  4   4  13   8  47  4.18  871/1391  4.18  4.52  4.30 4.35  4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16  0  2   1   3  15  55  4.58  593/1388  4.58  4.56  4.28 4.37  4.58
4. Were special techniques successful                  15  60  3   1   1   2  10  3.88 ****/ 958  ****  4.13  3.93 4.00  ****


           Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 91  0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  4.75  4.58 4.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 91  0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  5.00  4.52 3.00  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 91  0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  78  ****  4.83  4.47 ****  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    91  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  4.75  4.47 2.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                91  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  4.63  4.16 4.00  ****


           Self  Paced
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      89  1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  43  ****  5.00  4.69 ****  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       91  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  32  ****  3.67  4.37 1.00  ****


                                      Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type               Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    10      0.00-0.99    1      A    41       Required for Majors  3     Graduate     1      Major      62
  28-55     7      1.00-1.99    1      B    34
  56-83    15      2.00-2.99    4      C     1       General              1     Under-grad  91      Non-major  30
  84-150    7      3.00-3.49    8      D     0
  Grad.     1      3.50-4.00   14      F     1       Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P     0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I     0       Other               77
                                       ?     3
```

```
Course-Section: ART  220  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page  120
Title        ART HISTORY I                     Baltimore County                                     FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  FELDMAN, JOAN                      Fall   2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     110
Questionnaires: 63                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean   Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   2   0   1   4   7  17  32  4.23  919/1639  4.23  4.45  4.27  4.35  4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   1   1   7  16  37  4.40  684/1639  4.40  4.38  4.22  4.27  4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   1   0   3   1  13  44  4.61  417/1397  4.61  4.50  4.28  4.39  4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   5   1   3   6  27  20  4.09  953/1583  4.09  4.50  4.19  4.28  4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  6   2   3   8  18  25  4.09  714/1532  4.09  3.99  4.01  4.09  4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  2   8  13  24  15  3.68 1110/1504  3.68  3.89  4.05  4.09  3.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   1   9  17  35  4.39  656/1612  4.39  4.05  4.16  4.21  4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   1   0   1   0   2  58  4.92  595/1635  4.92  4.63  4.65  4.63  4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 13 3  0  0   9  24  14  4.11  830/1579  4.11  4.26  4.08  4.14  4.11


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0   0   5  13  43  4.62  656/1518  4.62  4.47  4.43  4.48  4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   4   0   0   0   1   3  55  4.92  491/1520  4.92  4.87  4.70  4.78  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0   0   1   6  22  31  4.38  747/1517  4.38  4.43  4.27  4.34  4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   0   2   2  12  45  4.64  489/1550  4.64  4.24  4.22  4.33  4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  3  0   2   2   8  44  4.68  179/1295  4.68  4.50  3.94  4.07  4.68


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 20 0  7   5   5  14  12  3.44 1139/1398  3.44  4.27  4.07  4.14  3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 20 0  2   1   7  15  18  4.07  954/1391  4.07  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 0  1  4  10  12  17  3.91 1035/1388  3.91  4.56  4.28  4.37  3.91
4. Were special techniques successful                  20  26  4   4   3   3   3  2.82  886/ 958  2.82  4.13  3.93  4.00  2.82


             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  56  4   0   1   2   0   0  2.67 ****/ 224  ****  4.96  4.10  4.33  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 59 0  1  0   0   1   2  3.75 ****/ 240  ****  4.60  4.11  4.47  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 58 3  0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/ 219  ****  2.29  4.44  4.61  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           57  5   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 57  5   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.18  4.08  ****


             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 57 2  0   0   1   2   1  4.00 ****/  85  ****  4.75  4.58  4.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 57 2 0   0   0   4   0  4.00 ****/  82  ****  5.00  4.52  3.00  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 57 2  0   1   0   2   1  3.75 ****/  78  ****  4.83  4.47  ****  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    57  2   0   0   0   1   3  4.75 ****/  80  ****  4.75  4.47  2.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                57  2   0   0   0   1   3  4.75 ****/  82  ****  4.63  4.16  4.00  ****


             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 58  0   1   0   1   1   2  3.60 ****/  52  ****  4.67  4.04  4.78  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 58  0   0   0   2   0   3  4.20 ****/  53  ****  3.87  4.05  4.28  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       58  1   0   0   0   1   3  4.75 ****/  42  ****  5.00  4.75  ****  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   58  3   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/  37  ****  5.00  4.58  ****  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 58  3   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  32  ****  4.50  4.56  ****  ****


             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 58 0  1   0   2   0   2  3.40 ****/  50  ****  4.79  4.45  3.24  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    57  3   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/  32  ****  5.00  4.51  4.33  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      57  2   0   0   1   0   3  4.50 ****/  43  ****  5.00  4.69  ****  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       57  4   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  32  ****  3.67  4.37  1.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     57  4   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  3.00  ****
```

```
Course-Section: ART  220  0101                University of Maryland                        Page  120
Title          ART HISTORY I                   Baltimore County                            FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    FELDMAN, JOAN                    Fall   2007                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    110
Questionnaires: 63                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    11         0.00-0.99    3        A   36         Required for Majors  21    Graduate    0      Major       27
 28-55     9         1.00-1.99    0        B   14
 56-83     6         2.00-2.99    1        C    5         General               6    Under-grad  63     Non-major   36
 84-150    5         3.00-3.49    4        D    1
 Grad.     0         3.50-4.00   14        F    0         Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                           I    0         Other                30
                                           ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ART  221  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  121
Title       ART HISTORY II                   Baltimore County                                FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   OTTESEN, BODIL                    Fall   2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    117
Questionnaires: 66                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   3   2  13  22  26  4.00 1138/1639  4.00  4.45  4.27  4.35  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   2   4  15  25  20  3.86 1287/1639  3.86  4.38  4.22  4.27  3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   3   4  11  22  26  3.97 1018/1397  3.97  4.50  4.28  4.39  3.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   5   1   4  14  18  24  3.98 1039/1583  3.98  4.50  4.19  4.28  3.98
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0   2   3  10  18  32  4.15  663/1532  4.15  3.99  4.01  4.09  4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 3  6   5  16  15  20  3.61 1147/1504  3.61  3.89  4.05  4.09  3.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   1   9  15  24  16  3.69 1310/1612  3.69  4.05  4.16  4.21  3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   1   9   9   8  19  19  3.47 1604/1635  3.47  4.63  4.65  4.63  3.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 2  1   2  11  32   8  3.81 1125/1579  3.81  4.26  4.08  4.14  3.81

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   1   1   4  28  31  4.34 1021/1518  4.34  4.47  4.43  4.48  4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   4   6  56  4.79  837/1520  4.79  4.87  4.70  4.78  4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   1   1  13  25  25  4.11 1025/1517  4.11  4.43  4.27  4.34  4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   1   1   4   5  12  42  4.41  769/1550  4.41  4.24  4.22  4.33  4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3  1   2   8  10  41  4.42  337/1295  4.42  4.50  3.94  4.07  4.42

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 19 0 17   4  10   5  11  2.77 1329/1398  2.77  4.27  4.07  4.14  2.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 20 0 15   7  15   6   3  2.46 1379/1391  2.46  4.52  4.30  4.35  2.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 21 0 14  9  11   5   6  2.56 1370/1388  2.56  4.56  4.28  4.37  2.56
4. Were special techniques successful                  23  41   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/ 958  ****  4.13  3.93  4.00  ****

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  56   9   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 224  ****  4.96  4.10  4.33  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 59 0 4  1   2   0   0  1.71 ****/ 240  ****  4.60  4.11  4.47  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 58 6  1   0   1   0   0  2.00 ****/ 219  ****  2.29  4.44  4.61  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           58   7   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 58   7   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.18  4.08  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 58 6  0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/  85  ****  4.75  4.58  4.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 59 3 0   0   0   0   4  5.00 ****/  82  ****  5.00  4.52  3.00  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 59 3  0   0   0   2   2  4.50 ****/  78  ****  4.83  4.47  ****  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    59   5   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  80  ****  4.75  4.47  2.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                59   4   0   0   1   0   2  4.33 ****/  82  ****  4.63  4.16  4.00  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 59   0   4   0   1   0   2  2.43 ****/  52  ****  4.67  4.04  4.78  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 59   0   2   0   3   1   1  2.86 ****/  53  ****  3.87  4.05  4.28  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   59   5   0   1   0   1   0  3.00 ****/  37  ****  5.00  4.58  ****  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 60   5   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  32  ****  4.50  4.56  ****  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 60  0   1   0   2   2   1  3.33 ****/  50  ****  4.79  4.45  3.24  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    60   5   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  32  ****  5.00  4.51  4.33  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      59   4   0   0   1   1   1  4.00 ****/  43  ****  5.00  4.69  ****  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       60   4   0   1   1   0   0  2.50 ****/  32  ****  3.67  4.37  1.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     61   4   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  3.00  ****
```

Title   ART HISTORY II   Baltimore County   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: OTTESEN, BODIL   Fall   2007   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 117
Questionnaires: 66   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   11   0.00-0.99   4   A   21   Required for Majors 18   Graduate   1   Major   28
 28-55   8   1.00-1.99   0   B   23
 56-83   10   2.00-2.99   5   C   14   General   7   Under-grad   65   Non-major   38
 84-150   2   3.00-3.49   5   D   0
 Grad.   1   3.50-4.00   11   F   0   Electives   1   #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0   responses to be significant
                                         I   0   Other   36
                                         ?   2

```
Course-Section: ART  305  0101              University of Maryland                          Page 122
Title          FILM I: MOVING IMAGES        Baltimore County                                FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    WORDEN, FRED                  Fall   2007                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     13
Questionnaires: 12                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  1 11  4.92  154/1639  4.92  4.45  4.27 4.28  4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  4  8  4.67  349/1639  4.67  4.38  4.22 4.20  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   3  0  0  2  3  4  4.22  822/1397  4.22  4.50  4.28 4.26  4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  0  2  2  7  4.45  536/1583  4.45  4.50  4.19 4.24  4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  3  0  1  1  4  3  4.00  774/1532  4.00  3.99  4.01 4.05  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2  0  0  1  5  4  4.30  568/1504  4.30  3.89  4.05 4.12  4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  0  5  6  4.55  449/1612  4.55  4.05  4.16 4.12  4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1635  5.00  4.63  4.65 4.66  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  0  0  4  5  4.56  332/1579  4.56  4.26  4.08 4.07  4.56


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  1  2  8  4.64  643/1518  4.64  4.47  4.43 4.39  4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91  546/1520  4.91  4.87  4.70 4.68  4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  4  7  4.64  439/1517  4.64  4.43  4.27 4.23  4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  1  1  9  4.73  388/1550  4.73  4.24  4.22 4.20  4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91   82/1295  4.91  4.50  3.94 3.95  4.91


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0  0  0  1  3  3  4.29  599/1398  4.29  4.27  4.07 4.13  4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  441/1391  4.71  4.52  4.30 4.35  4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  435/1388  4.71  4.56  4.28 4.34  4.71
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   2  1  0  1  1  2  3.60  682/ 958  3.60  4.13  3.93 3.97  3.60


                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ART  315  0101                 University of Maryland                              Page  123
Title       VIDEO I                              Baltimore County                                 FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   GRABILL, VIN                         Fall   2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      10
Questionnaires:   8                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  4  4  0  3.50 1497/1639  3.50  4.45  4.27  4.28  3.50
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  2  3  3  4.13  992/1639  4.13  4.38  4.22  4.20  4.13
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  1  1  4  1  3.71 1195/1397  3.71  4.50  4.28  4.26  3.71
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  2  2  4  4.25  792/1583  4.25  4.50  4.19  4.24  4.25
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  1  0  3  3  1  3.38 1312/1532  3.38  3.99  4.01  4.05  3.38
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4  0  0  3  0  1  3.50 1212/1504  3.50  3.89  4.05  4.12  3.50
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  1  1  1  4  3.75 1279/1612  3.75  4.05  4.16  4.12  3.75
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1635  5.00  4.63  4.65  4.66  5.00
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1  0  0  1  3  1  4.00  889/1579  4.00  4.26  4.08  4.07  4.00


              Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  1  1  2  3  4.00 1237/1518  4.00  4.47  4.43  4.39  4.00
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1520  5.00  4.87  4.70  4.68  5.00
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  2  1  3  4.17  973/1517  4.17  4.43  4.27  4.23  4.17
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  0  1  1  1  3  4.00 1077/1550  4.00  4.24  4.22  4.20  4.00
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0  0  0  0  3  3  4.50  265/1295  4.50  4.50  3.94  3.95  4.50


              Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  426/1398  4.50  4.27  4.07  4.13  4.50
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  616/1391  4.50  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.50
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  1  0  0  1  4  4.17  887/1388  4.17  4.56  4.28  4.34  4.17
 4. Were special techniques successful                  2   4  0  1  0  0  1  3.50  725/ 958  3.50  4.13  3.93  3.97  3.50


              Laboratory
 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  7   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 224  ****  4.96  4.10  4.06  ****
 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 240  ****  4.60  4.11  4.08  ****


              Field Work
 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 6   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/ 52  5.00  4.67  4.04  4.78  5.00
 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 6   0  1  0  0  1  0  2.50   49/ 53  2.50  3.87  4.05  4.31  2.50
 3. Was the instructor available for consultation       6   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/ 42  5.00  5.00  4.75  4.63  5.00
 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   6   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/ 37  5.00  5.00  4.58  4.52  5.00
 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50   17/ 32  4.50  4.50  4.56  4.30  4.50


              Self  Paced
 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 50  ****  4.79  4.45  5.00  ****
 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      7   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 43  ****  5.00  4.69  5.00  ****


                                          Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: ART  320  0101              University of Maryland                           Page  124
Title      INTRO TO PRINTMAKING             Baltimore County                                 FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   BOWLER, RUTH S                Fall   2007                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    12
Questionnaires:  9                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   1   2   6  4.56  561/1639  4.56  4.45  4.27  4.28  4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   1   1   1   3   3  3.67 1410/1639  3.67  4.38  4.22  4.20  3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   3   1   1   0   2   2  3.50 1268/1397  3.50  4.50  4.28  4.26  3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   1   1   0   3   4  3.89 1171/1583  3.89  4.50  4.19  4.24  3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2   1   1   3   1   1  3.00 1421/1532  3.00  3.99  4.01  4.05  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2  0   0   2   1   3  4.17  701/1504  4.17  3.89  4.05  4.12  4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   2   1   4   1   1  2.78 1561/1612  2.78  4.05  4.16  4.12  2.78
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   6   3  4.33 1288/1635  4.33  4.63  4.65  4.66  4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0   1   2   3   1  3.57 1284/1579  3.57  4.26  4.08  4.07  3.57


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   1   1   0   5   1  3.50 1419/1518  3.50  4.47  4.43  4.39  3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   1   2   6  4.56 1151/1520  4.56  4.87  4.70  4.68  4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   2   0   2   3   2  3.33 1405/1517  3.33  4.43  4.27  4.23  3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   1   2   1   3   2  3.33 1385/1550  3.33  4.24  4.22  4.20  3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 4  1   0   1   1   1  3.25 1101/1295  3.25  4.50  3.94  3.95  3.25


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   1   1   2   4  4.13  721/1398  4.13  4.27  4.07  4.13  4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0   0   0   1   2   5  4.50  616/1391  4.50  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0  0   0   1   1   6  4.63  546/1388  4.63  4.56  4.28  4.34  4.63
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   7   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 958  ****  4.13  3.93  3.97  ****


                              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       8
 28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0       B    4
 56-83      0       2.00-2.99    1       C    1       General              3     Under-grad    9      Non-major   1
 84-150     7       3.00-3.49    3       D    0
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    2       F    0       Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                5
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ART  323  0101                    University of Maryland                                          Page  125
Title       20TH CENTURY ART                       Baltimore County                                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  FAGAN, JASON                               Fall   2007                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      46
Questionnaires:  37                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                      Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                       NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  0  2 13 21  4.43  712/1639  4.55  4.45  4.27 4.28  4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  3 13 21  4.49  550/1639  4.58  4.38  4.22 4.20  4.49
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1 15 21  4.54  477/1397  4.69  4.50  4.28 4.26  4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   7  2  5  1  8 14  3.90 1158/1583  4.31  4.50  4.19 4.24  3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  1  1  2 10 23  4.43  409/1532  4.18  3.99  4.01 4.05  4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3  1  2  8  8 15  4.00  824/1504  4.15  3.89  4.05 4.12  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  5 11 21  4.43  589/1612  4.53  4.05  4.16 4.12  4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  4 33  4.89  676/1635  4.93  4.63  4.65 4.66  4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1  2  1  5 15 11  3.94  989/1579  4.21  4.26  4.08 4.07  3.94


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  2  7 27  4.69  561/1518  4.81  4.47  4.43 4.39  4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  1  1 34  4.92  491/1520  4.96  4.87  4.70 4.68  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  5  6 25  4.56  535/1517  4.73  4.43  4.27 4.23  4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  3  7 26  4.64  489/1550  4.70  4.24  4.22 4.20  4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3  0  0  1  5 27  4.79  119/1295  4.81  4.50  3.94 3.95  4.79


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0  5  1  4  2 11  3.57 1086/1398  3.93  4.27  4.07 4.13  3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 0  2  1  2  2 16  4.26  808/1391  4.53  4.52  4.30 4.35  4.26
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 1  0  1  3 18  4.61  571/1388  4.72  4.56  4.28 4.34  4.61
4. Were special techniques successful                  14  19  1  0  0  0  3  4.00 ****/ 958  4.14  4.13  3.93 3.97  ****


              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 35 0 1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/ 240  ****  4.60  4.11 4.08  ****


              Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 35 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  82  ****  5.00  4.52 4.59  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 35 1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  78  ****  4.83  4.47 4.60  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                35  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  4.63  4.16 4.08  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 36 0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  52  ****  4.67  4.04 4.78  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 36 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  3.87  4.05 4.31  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       35  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  42  ****  5.00  4.75 4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   35  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  37  ****  5.00  4.58 4.52  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 36 0 0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  50  ****  4.79  4.45 5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      36  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  43  ****  5.00  4.69 5.00  ****


                                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades            Reasons                 Type                    Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1      0.00-0.99    0      A    17       Required for Majors    3     Graduate       0       Major      21
  28-55      6      1.00-1.99    0      B    13                                                          Non-major  16
  56-83      7      2.00-2.99    2      C     7       General                5     Under-grad    37
  84-150     6      3.00-3.49    6      D     0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   11      F     0       Electives              0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P     0                                    responses to be significant
                                        I     0       Other                 29
                                        ?     0
```

```
Course-Section: ART  323  0102                University of Maryland                              Page  126
Title       20TH CENTURY ART                 Baltimore County                                    FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  JACOB, PREMINDA                 Fall   2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    36
Questionnaires: 30                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

```
                                       General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course       0    0    0    1    1    5   23   4.67   430/1639   4.55   4.45   4.27   4.28   4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals        0    0    0    0    1    8   21   4.67   349/1639   4.58   4.38   4.22   4.20   4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals       0    0    0    0    0    5   25   4.83   209/1397   4.69   4.50   4.28   4.26   4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals        0    2    0    0    1    6   21   4.71   281/1583   4.31   4.50   4.19   4.24   4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned    0    0    2    2    6    6   14   3.93   869/1532   4.18   3.99   4.01   4.05   3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0    0    0    1    6    6   17   4.30   568/1504   4.15   3.89   4.05   4.12   4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained               0    0    0    1    1    6   22   4.63   352/1612   4.53   4.05   4.16   4.12   4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled                      1    0    0    0    0    1   28   4.97   265/1635   4.93   4.63   4.65   4.66   4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11    0    0    1    1    5   12   4.47   416/1579   4.21   4.26   4.08   4.07   4.47

                                       Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           0    0    0    0    0    2   28   4.93   149/1518   4.81   4.47   4.43   4.39   4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      1    0    0    0    0    0   29   5.00     1/1520   4.96   4.87   4.70   4.68   5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   0    0    0    0    0    3   27   4.90   157/1517   4.73   4.43   4.27   4.23   4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        1    0    0    1    0    4   24   4.76   351/1550   4.70   4.24   4.22   4.20   4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  0    0    0    0    1    3   26   4.83   100/1295   4.81   4.50   3.94   3.95   4.83

                                       Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   6    0    0    1    6    2   15   4.29   590/1398   3.93   4.27   4.07   4.13   4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   6    0    0    0    1    3   20   4.79   344/1391   4.53   4.52   4.30   4.35   4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  5    0    0    0    0    4   21   4.84   286/1388   4.72   4.56   4.28   4.34   4.84
4. Were special techniques successful                     6    2    0    2    4    5   11   4.14   418/ 958   4.14   4.13   3.93   3.97   4.14

                                       Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material    29    0    0    0    0    0    1   5.00 ****/ 224   ****   4.96   4.10   4.06   ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 29    0    0    0    0    0    1   5.00 ****/ 240   ****   4.60   4.11   4.08   ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 29    0    0    0    0    0    1   5.00 ****/ 219   ****   2.29   4.44   4.44   ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance             29    0    0    0    0    0    1   5.00 ****/ 215   ****   ****   4.35   4.21   ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified   29    0    0    0    0    0    1   5.00 ****/ 198   ****   ****   4.18   4.04   ****

                                       Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  29    0    0    0    0    0    1   5.00 ****/  85   ****   4.75   4.58   4.50   ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 29    0    0    0    0    0    1   5.00 ****/  82   ****   5.00   4.52   4.59   ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  29    0    0    0    0    0    1   5.00 ****/  78   ****   4.83   4.47   4.60   ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned      29    0    0    0    0    0    1   5.00 ****/  80   ****   4.75   4.47   4.65   ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                  29    0    0    0    0    0    1   5.00 ****/  82   ****   4.63   4.16   4.08   ****

                                       Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned   29    0    0    0    0    0    1   5.00 ****/  52   ****   4.67   4.04   4.78   ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria   29    0    0    0    0    0    1   5.00 ****/  53   ****   3.87   4.05   4.31   ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation         29    0    0    0    0    0    1   5.00 ****/  42   ****   5.00   4.75   4.63   ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations     29    0    0    0    0    0    1   5.00 ****/  37   ****   5.00   4.58   4.52   ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities   29    0    0    0    0    0    1   5.00 ****/  32   ****   4.50   4.56   4.30   ****

                                       Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  29    0    0    0    0    0    1   5.00 ****/  50   ****   4.79   4.45   5.00   ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal      29    0    0    0    0    0    1   5.00 ****/  32   ****   5.00   4.51   5.00   ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful        29    0    0    0    0    0    1   5.00 ****/  43   ****   5.00   4.69   5.00   ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful         29    0    0    0    0    0    1   5.00 ****/  32   ****   3.67   4.37   5.00   ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students       29    0    0    0    0    0    1   5.00 ****/  21   ****   ****   4.52   5.00   ****
```

                                            Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   2   0.00-0.99   1   A   21   Required for Majors   1   Graduate   1   Major   17
 28-55   7   1.00-1.99   2   B   6
 56-83   5   2.00-2.99   2   C   1   General   3   Under-grad   29   Non-major   13
 84-150   3   3.00-3.49   2   D   1
 Grad.   1   3.50-4.00   7   F   0   Electives   1   #### - Means there are not enough
                                              P   0   responses to be significant
                                              I   0   Other   23
                                              ?   1

```
Course-Section: ART  324  0101            University of Maryland                                          Page  127
Title         HISTORY OF FILM TO 196            Baltimore County                                      FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   STURGEON, JOHN                       Fall   2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      61
Questionnaires:  28                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                 Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                  NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0   1   5   2   8  11  3.85 1289/1639  3.85  4.45  4.27  4.28  3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   1   7   3   7   9  3.59 1447/1639  3.59  4.38  4.22  4.20  3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0   1   1   5   6  14  4.15  897/1397  4.15  4.50  4.28  4.26  4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  19   1   0   1   4   2  3.75 1261/1583  3.75  4.50  4.19  4.24  3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  0   2   2   2   8  12  4.00  774/1532  4.00  3.99  4.01  4.05  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 16  2   1   2   4   1  3.10 1392/1504  3.10  3.89  4.05  4.12  3.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            3   0   2   1   2   9  11  4.04 1016/1612  4.04  4.05  4.16  4.12  4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0   0   0   0  16  10  4.38 1250/1635  4.38  4.63  4.65  4.66  4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  1   0   2   6  12   3  3.70 1214/1579  3.70  4.26  4.08  4.07  3.70


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   1   0   3   5  17  4.42  919/1518  4.42  4.47  4.43  4.39  4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   0   3   3  20  4.65 1047/1520  4.65  4.87  4.70  4.68  4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   1   3   2   8  12  4.04 1065/1517  4.04  4.43  4.27  4.23  4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   3   1   2   8  12  3.96 1110/1550  3.96  4.24  4.22  4.20  3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0   0   1   1   4  19  4.64  197/1295  4.64  4.50  3.94  3.95  4.64


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16 0   4   1   2   2   3  2.92 1308/1398  2.92  4.27  4.07  4.13  2.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16 0   3   2   2   2   3  3.00 1321/1391  3.00  4.52  4.30  4.35  3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0  4   2   1   2   4  3.00 1320/1388  3.00  4.56  4.28  4.34  3.00


                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0       0.00-0.99   0       A   10       Required for Majors   4     Graduate      0       Major       12
 28-55      3       1.00-1.99   0       B   13
 56-83      2       2.00-2.99   4       C    1       General              12     Under-grad   28       Non-major   16
 84-150     4       3.00-3.49   9       D    0
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   0       F    0       Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                 9
                                        ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: ART  326   0101                University of Maryland                                    Page  128
Title         HIST. OF PHOTOGRAPHY I           Baltimore County                                        FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   STEPHANY, JAROM                  Fall   2007                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       29
Questionnaires:   25                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  2  1  5  17  4.48   642/1639   4.48  4.45  4.27  4.28  4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  2  2  4  2  15  4.04  1059/1639   4.04  4.38  4.22  4.20  4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   1  1  2  1  2  18  4.42   646/1397   4.42  4.50  4.28  4.26  4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2  0  2  1  2  18  4.57   413/1583   4.57  4.50  4.19  4.24  4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   4  1  0  1  5  14  4.48   366/1532   4.48  3.99  4.01  4.05  4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  1  1  1  2  19  4.54   336/1504   4.54  3.89  4.05  4.12  4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  2  3  6  13  4.12   955/1612   4.12  4.05  4.16  4.12  4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1  0  0  0  0  24  5.00     1/1635   5.00  4.63  4.65  4.66  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 2  1  0  3  4  12  4.30   601/1579   4.30  4.26  4.08  4.07  4.30


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  1  1  1  2  19  4.54   757/1518   4.54  4.47  4.43  4.39  4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  2  22  4.92   491/1520   4.92  4.87  4.70  4.68  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  1  1  1  3  18  4.50   597/1517   4.50  4.43  4.27  4.23  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   1  1  0  1  1  20  4.70   424/1550   4.70  4.24  4.22  4.20  4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0  1  0  1  2  19  4.65   191/1295   4.65  4.50  3.94  3.95  4.65


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0  3  0  1  0   9  3.92   863/1398   3.92  4.27  4.07  4.13  3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0  2  0  2  3   6  3.85  1100/1391   3.85  4.52  4.30  4.35  3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 1  0  3  2   7  4.08   925/1388   4.08  4.56  4.28  4.34  4.08
4. Were special techniques successful                  13   5  0  1  0  0   6  4.57   185/ 958   4.57  4.13  3.93  3.97  4.57


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  24   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/ 224   ****  4.96  4.10  4.06  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 24 0 0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/ 240   ****  4.60  4.11  4.08  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 24 0 0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/ 219   ****  2.29  4.44  4.44  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 24   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/ 198   ****  ****  4.18  4.04  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23 0  0  0  0  0   2  5.00  ****/  85   ****  4.75  4.58  4.50  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0 0  0  0  1   1  4.50  ****/  82   ****  5.00  4.52  4.59  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23 0  0  0  0  0   2  5.00  ****/  78   ****  4.83  4.47  4.60  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    23   0  0  0  0  0   2  5.00  ****/  80   ****  4.75  4.47  4.65  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                23   0  0  0  0  1   1  4.50  ****/  82   ****  4.63  4.16  4.08  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 24   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  52   ****  4.67  4.04  4.78  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 24   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  53   ****  3.87  4.05  4.31  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       24   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  42   ****  5.00  4.75  4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   24   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  37   ****  5.00  4.58  4.52  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 24   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  32   ****  4.50  4.56  4.30  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 24 0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  50   ****  4.79  4.45  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    24   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  32   ****  5.00  4.51  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      24   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  43   ****  5.00  4.69  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       24   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  32   ****  3.67  4.37  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     24   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  21   ****  ****  4.52  5.00  ****
```

```
Course-Section: ART  326  0101              University of Maryland                      Page  128
Title           HIST. OF PHOTOGRAPHY I        Baltimore County                          FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:     STEPHANY, JAROM              Fall   2007                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      29
Questionnaires:  25                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades           Reasons                   Type                    Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    1         0.00-0.99   0         A    7          Required for Majors  9      Graduate     0      Major        7
 28-55    1         1.00-1.99   0         B   12
 56-83    5         2.00-2.99   3         C    2          General              7      Under-grad  25      Non-major   18
 84-150   3         3.00-3.49   2         D    0
 Grad.    0         3.50-4.00   4         F    0          Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                      responses to be significant
                                          I    0          Other                5
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ART  331  0101              University of Maryland                              Page  129
Title        GRAPHIC DESIGN I                  Baltimore County                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  APOSTOLIDES, HE                    Fall   2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     20
Questionnaires: 17                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   1   2   2  12  4.47  656/1639  4.04  4.45  4.27  4.28  4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   5  11  4.59  435/1639  3.96  4.38  4.22  4.20  4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  13   0   0   0   1   3  4.75 ****/1397  ****  4.50  4.28  4.26  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   0   1   1  14  4.81  181/1583  3.97  4.50  4.19  4.24  4.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  12   0   1   0   1   3  4.20  633/1532  3.89  3.99  4.01  4.05  4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 14  0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/1504  ****  3.89  4.05  4.12  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   1   1   1   4  10  4.24  837/1612  3.54  4.05  4.16  4.12  4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   1  11   5  4.24 1366/1635  4.40  4.63  4.65  4.66  4.24
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1  0   1   1   7   5  4.14  783/1579  3.89  4.26  4.08  4.07  4.14

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   1   0   1   2  11  4.47  863/1518  3.96  4.47  4.43  4.39  4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   1   0   0   4  11  4.50 1188/1520  4.53  4.87  4.70  4.68  4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   0   2   2  12  4.63  451/1517  4.17  4.43  4.27  4.23  4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   2   0   3   2  10  4.06 1053/1550  3.76  4.24  4.22  4.20  4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 5  0   0   0   3   7  4.70  167/1295  4.12  4.50  3.94  3.95  4.70

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   0   0   2  14  4.88  177/1398  4.24  4.27  4.07  4.13  4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0   0   0   0   3  13  4.81  321/1391  3.91  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0  0   0   0   1  15  4.94  157/1388  4.17  4.56  4.28  4.34  4.94
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   9   0   0   0   3   4  4.57  185/ 958  4.04  4.13  3.93  3.97  4.57

            Seminar
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   16   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  4.75  4.47  4.65  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               16   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  82  ****  4.63  4.16  4.08  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  52  ****  4.67  4.04  4.78  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  53  ****  3.87  4.05  4.31  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  16   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  37  ****  5.00  4.58  4.52  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  32  ****  4.50  4.56  4.30  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  50  ****  4.79  4.45  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     16   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  43  ****  5.00  4.69  5.00  ****

                                  Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades      Reasons                Type               Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0        0.00-0.99    0        A   12      Required for Majors  0     Graduate      0      Major       13
  28-55     2        1.00-1.99    0        B    3
  56-83     2        2.00-2.99    0        C    0      General              1     Under-grad   17      Non-major    4
  84-150    1        3.00-3.49    1        D    0
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00    5        F    0      Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                responses to be significant
                                           I    0      Other               13
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ART  331  0201            University of Maryland                              Page  130
Title       GRAPHIC DESIGN I               Baltimore County                                  FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   COATES, JOSEPH               Fall   2007                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     20
Questionnaires:  18                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  2  2  3  5  6 3.61 1447/1639  4.04  4.45 4.27 4.28  3.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  2  2  5  6  3 3.33 1536/1639  3.96  4.38 4.22 4.20  3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1  16  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/1397  ****  4.50 4.28 4.26  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   3  4  1  3  3  4 3.13 1513/1583  3.97  4.50 4.19 4.24  3.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  11  0  2  1  2  2 3.57 1201/1532  3.89  3.99 4.01 4.05  3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 16  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/1504  ****  3.89 4.05 4.12  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   4  3  3  2  3  2 2.85 1554/1612  3.54  4.05 4.16 4.12  2.85
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  8 10 4.56 1101/1635  4.40  4.63 4.65 4.66  4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0  0  2  1  7  1 3.64 1251/1579  3.89  4.26 4.08 4.07  3.64


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  2  3  2  7  4 3.44 1432/1518  3.96  4.47 4.43 4.39  3.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  1  0  2  0 15 4.56 1151/1520  4.53  4.87 4.70 4.68  4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  1  3  3  3  7 3.71 1280/1517  4.17  4.43 4.27 4.23  3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  3  0  4  6  4 3.47 1340/1550  3.76  4.24 4.22 4.20  3.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  1  1  1  5  5  3 3.53  963/1295  4.12  4.50 3.94 3.95  3.53


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  2  0  4  5  4 3.60 1074/1398  4.24  4.27 4.07 4.13  3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  2  4  4  2  3 3.00 1321/1391  3.91  4.52 4.30 4.35  3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  0  3  6  3  3 3.40 1226/1388  4.17  4.56 4.28 4.34  3.40
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   9  0  1  2  2  1 3.50  725/ 958  4.04  4.13 3.93 3.97  3.50


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  85  ****  4.75 4.58 4.50  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0 0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  82  ****  5.00 4.52 4.59  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17 0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  78  ****  4.83 4.47 4.60  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    17  0  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/  80  ****  4.75 4.47 4.65  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                17  0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  82  ****  4.63 4.16 4.08  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16  0  0  1  0  1  0 3.00 ****/  52  ****  4.67 4.04 4.78  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16  0  1  0  0  1  0 2.50 ****/  53  ****  3.87 4.05 4.31  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       16  1  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/  42  ****  5.00 4.75 4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   16  1  1  0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/  37  ****  5.00 4.58 4.52  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0  0  1  0  1  0 3.00 ****/  50  ****  4.79 4.45 5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      16  0  0  1  1  0  0 2.50 ****/  43  ****  5.00 4.69 5.00  ****


                                    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       14
  28-55    4        1.00-1.99   0        B    5
  56-83    3        2.00-2.99   0        C    0     General              0     Under-grad   18      Non-major    4
  84-150   0        3.00-3.49   1        D    0
  Grad.    0        3.50-4.00   4        F    0     Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                               responses to be significant
                                         I    0     Other               16
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ART 332  0101           University of Maryland                              Page  131
Title          GRAPHIC DESIGN II         Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    CUSTEN, CALVIN  (Instr. A)       Fall   2007                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     14
Questionnaires: 14                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    2   0  0  0  1  2   9  4.67  430/1639  4.54  4.45  4.27  4.28  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     2   0  0  0  0  6   6  4.50  517/1639  4.43  4.38  4.22  4.20  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    2   6  0  0  0  3   3  4.50  517/1397  4.50  4.50  4.28  4.26  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     2   0  0  0  0  3   9  4.75  239/1583  4.70  4.50  4.19  4.24  4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   6  0  0  2  1   3  4.17  655/1532  4.17  3.99  4.01  4.05  4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 2  2  0  0  3   5  3.90  945/1504  3.90  3.89  4.05  4.12  3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0  0  0  2  3   7  4.42  617/1612  4.31  4.05  4.16  4.12  4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   1  0  0  0  9   3  4.25 1350/1635  4.26  4.63  4.65  4.66  4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0  0  1  4   3  4.25  657/1579  4.13  4.26  4.08  4.07  4.25


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0  0  0  0  5   6  4.55  757/1518  4.19  4.47  4.43  4.39  4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0  0  0  0  0  11  5.00    1/1520  4.92  4.87  4.70  4.68  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  0  1  5   5  4.36  768/1517  4.14  4.43  4.27  4.23  4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   1  0  1  1  1   9  4.50  638/1550  3.27  4.24  4.22  4.20  3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1  0  1  0  0   8  4.67  185/1295  4.28  4.50  3.94  3.95  4.67


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  0  1  0  2   6  4.44  477/1398  4.46  4.27  4.07  4.13  4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  0  0  0  1   8  4.89  248/1391  4.89  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0  0  0  1   8  4.89  244/1388  4.87  4.56  4.28  4.34  4.89
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   3  0  1  0  2   3  4.17  399/ 958  3.98  4.13  3.93  3.97  4.17


           Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 0 0 0  1   0  4.00 ****/ 240  ****  4.60  4.11  4.08  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 0 0 0 0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 219  ****  2.29  4.44  4.44  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           13  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.21  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.18  4.04  ****


           Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 0 0 0 0  0   1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  4.75  4.58  4.50  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 0 0 0 0 0   1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  5.00  4.52  4.59  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0  0   1  5.00 ****/  78  ****  4.83  4.47  4.60  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    13  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  4.75  4.47  4.65  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                13  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  4.63  4.16  4.08  ****


           Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00 ****/  52  ****  4.67  4.04  4.78  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  3.87  4.05  4.31  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       13  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  5.00  4.75  4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   13  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  37  ****  5.00  4.58  4.52  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00 ****/  32  ****  4.50  4.56  4.30  ****


           Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0  1   0  4.00 ****/  50  ****  4.79  4.45  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    13  0  1  0  0  0   0  1.00 ****/  32  ****  5.00  4.51  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      13  0  1  0  0  0   0  1.00 ****/  43  ****  5.00  4.69  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       13  0  0  0  1  0   0  3.00 ****/  32  ****  3.67  4.37  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     13  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  5.00  ****
```

```
Course-Section: ART  332  0101                University of Maryland                    Page  131
Title          GRAPHIC DESIGN II                 Baltimore County                       FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    CUSTEN, CALVIN  (Instr. A)         Fall   2007                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      14
Questionnaires:  14                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                       Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned           Cum. GPA          Expected Grades            Reasons                 Type                    Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0        0.00-0.99    1       A    11        Required for Majors   0    Graduate      0        Major       8
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0       B     0
  56-83      2        2.00-2.99    0       C     0        General               0    Under-grad   14        Non-major   6
  84-150     1        3.00-3.49    4       D     0
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    5       F     0        Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P     0                                   responses to be significant
                                           I     0        Other                10
                                           ?     0
```

```
Course-Section: ART  332  0101            University of Maryland                                  Page  132
Title       GRAPHIC DESIGN II             Baltimore County                                      FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:                (Instr. B)          Fall   2007                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      14
Questionnaires: 14                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    2   0  0  0  1  2  9  4.67  430/1639  4.54  4.45  4.27  4.28  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     2   0  0  0  0  6  6  4.50  517/1639  4.43  4.38  4.22  4.20  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    2   6  0  0  0  3  3  4.50  517/1397  4.50  4.50  4.28  4.26  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     2   0  0  0  0  3  9  4.75  239/1583  4.70  4.50  4.19  4.24  4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   6  0  0  2  1  3  4.17  655/1532  4.17  3.99  4.01  4.05  4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 2  2  0  0  3  5  3.90  945/1504  3.90  3.89  4.05  4.12  3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0  0  0  2  3  7  4.42  617/1612  4.31  4.05  4.16  4.12  4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   1  0  0  0  9  3  4.25 1350/1635  4.26  4.63  4.65  4.66  4.25

            Lecture
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     9   1  0  3  0  1  0  2.50 1491/1550  3.27  4.24  4.22  4.20  3.00


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  0  1  0  2  6  4.44  477/1398  4.46  4.27  4.07  4.13  4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  248/1391  4.89  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  244/1388  4.87  4.56  4.28  4.34  4.89
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   3  0  1  0  2  3  4.17  399/ 958  3.98  4.13  3.93  3.97  4.17

            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 240  ****  4.60  4.11  4.08  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 219  ****  2.29  4.44  4.44  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           13   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.21  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.18  4.04  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  4.75  4.58  4.50  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  5.00  4.52  4.59  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  78  ****  4.83  4.47  4.60  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    13   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  4.75  4.47  4.65  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                13   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  4.63  4.16  4.08  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  52  ****  4.67  4.04  4.78  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  3.87  4.05  4.31  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       13   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  5.00  4.75  4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   13   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  37  ****  5.00  4.58  4.52  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  32  ****  4.50  4.56  4.30  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  50  ****  4.79  4.45  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    13   0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  32  ****  5.00  4.51  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      13   0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  43  ****  5.00  4.69  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       13   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  32  ****  3.67  4.37  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     13   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  5.00  ****
```

```
Course-Section: ART  332  0101          University of Maryland                      Page  132
Title          GRAPHIC DESIGN II         Baltimore County                          FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:                (Instr. B)    Fall   2007                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     14
Questionnaires: 14                Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                               Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                   Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    0        0.00-0.99   1      A   11        Required for Majors  0    Graduate    0      Major        8
  28-55    0        1.00-1.99   0      B    0                                                     
  56-83    2        2.00-2.99   0      C    0        General              0    Under-grad  14     Non-major    6
  84-150   1        3.00-3.49   4      D    0
  Grad.    0        3.50-4.00   5      F    0        Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0        Other               10
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ART 332  0101              University of Maryland                              Page  133
Title         GRAPHIC DESIGN II              Baltimore County                                 FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:                  (Instr. C)           Fall   2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       14
Questionnaires: 14                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
         Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
         General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    2   0   0   0   1   2   9  4.67  430/1639  4.54  4.45  4.27  4.28  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     2   0   0   0   0   6   6  4.50  517/1639  4.43  4.38  4.22  4.20  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    2   6   0   0   0   3   3  4.50  517/1397  4.50  4.50  4.28  4.26  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     2   0   0   0   0   3   9  4.75  239/1583  4.70  4.50  4.19  4.24  4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   6   0   0   2   1   3  4.17  655/1532  4.17  3.99  4.01  4.05  4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  2   2   0   0   3   5  3.90  945/1504  3.90  3.89  4.05  4.12  3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0   0   0   2   3   7  4.42  617/1612  4.31  4.05  4.16  4.12  4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   1   0   0   0   9   3  4.25 1350/1635  4.26  4.63  4.65  4.66  4.25

         Lecture
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     8   2   0   4   0   0   0  2.00 1518/1550  3.27  4.24  4.22  4.20  3.00


         Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0   0   1   0   2   6  4.44  477/1398  4.46  4.27  4.07  4.13  4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0   0   0   0   1   8  4.89  248/1391  4.89  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0   0   0   0   1   8  4.89  244/1388  4.87  4.56  4.28  4.34  4.89
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   3   0   1   0   2   3  4.17  399/ 958  3.98  4.13  3.93  3.97  4.17

         Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 240  ****  4.60  4.11  4.08  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 219  ****  2.29  4.44  4.44  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           13  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.21  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.18  4.04  ****

         Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  4.75  4.58  4.50  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  5.00  4.52  4.59  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  78  ****  4.83  4.47  4.60  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    13  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  4.75  4.47  4.65  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                13  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  4.63  4.16  4.08  ****

         Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  52  ****  4.67  4.04  4.78  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  3.87  4.05  4.31  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       13  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  5.00  4.75  4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   13  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  37  ****  5.00  4.58  4.52  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  32  ****  4.50  4.56  4.30  ****

         Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  50  ****  4.79  4.45  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    13  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  32  ****  5.00  4.51  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      13  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  43  ****  5.00  4.69  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       13  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  32  ****  3.67  4.37  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     13  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  5.00  ****
```

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 14   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   0   0.00-0.99   1   A   11   Required for Majors   0   Graduate   0   Major   8
28-55   0   1.00-1.99   0   B   0
56-83   2   2.00-2.99   0   C   0   General   0   Under-grad   14   Non-major   6
84-150   1   3.00-3.49   4   D   0
Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   5   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0   responses to be significant
                                         I   0   Other   10
                                         ?   0

```
Course-Section: ART  332  0102                    University of Maryland                                    Page  134
Title      GRAPHIC DESIGN II                        Baltimore County                                      FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   CUSTEN, CALVIN                          Fall   2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    16
Questionnaires: 13                              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                     Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level   Sect
              Questions                     NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   1   9   3  4.15 1003/1639  4.54  4.45  4.27  4.28  4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   2   6   5  4.23  877/1639  4.43  4.38  4.22  4.20  4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  11   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/1397  4.50  4.50  4.28  4.26  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   6   7  4.54  444/1583  4.70  4.50  4.19  4.24  4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  10   1   0   1   1   0  2.67 ****/1504  3.90  3.89  4.05  4.12  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   1   0   0   4   4   4  4.00 1044/1612  4.31  4.05  4.16  4.12  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   9   4  4.31 1311/1635  4.26  4.63  4.65  4.66  4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  1   0   1   0   2   4   5  4.00  889/1579  4.13  4.26  4.08  4.07  4.00


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   1   3   5   3  3.83 1341/1518  4.19  4.47  4.43  4.39  3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   0   2  10  4.83  725/1520  4.92  4.87  4.70  4.68  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  1   0   0   1   3   4   4  3.92 1172/1517  4.14  4.43  4.27  4.23  3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0   1   2   4   5  4.08 1038/1550  3.27  4.24  4.22  4.20  4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  3   0   1   0   1   5   3  3.90  731/1295  4.28  4.50  3.94  3.95  3.90


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  3   0   0   0   1   3   6  4.50  426/1398  4.46  4.27  4.07  4.13  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  3   0   0   0   0   1   9  4.90  227/1391  4.89  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  2   0   0   0   0   2   9  4.82  317/1388  4.87  4.56  4.28  4.34  4.82
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   5   0   1   2   1   1  3.40  769/ 958  3.98  4.13  3.93  3.97  3.40


                                            Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades         Reasons               Type                  Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0        0.00-0.99    1        A   12         Required for Majors   0     Graduate      0       Major      12
  28-55      1        1.00-1.99    0        B    1
  56-83      1        2.00-2.99    1        C    0         General               1     Under-grad   13       Non-major   1
  84-150     2        3.00-3.49    0        D    0
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    4        F    0         Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                            I    0         Other                11
                                            ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ART  333  0101            University of Maryland                        Page  135
Title        GRAPHIC DESIGN III               Baltimore County                          FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  CAMPBELL, SUSAN                  Fall   2007                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      27
Questionnaires:  26                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  7 19  4.73  342/1639  4.73  4.45  4.27  4.28  4.73
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  4 21  4.77  241/1639  4.77  4.38  4.22  4.20  4.77
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  1  0  4 20  4.72  323/1397  4.72  4.50  4.28  4.26  4.72
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   3  0  0  1  3 19  4.78  207/1583  4.78  4.50  4.19  4.24  4.78
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  1  0  2  5 18  4.50  335/1532  4.50  3.99  4.01  4.05  4.50
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 19  0  0  0  2  4  4.67 ****/1504  ****  3.89  4.05  4.12  ****
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   2  0  0  4  6 14  4.42  617/1612  4.42  4.05  4.16  4.12  4.42
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0 11 14  4.56 1094/1635  4.56  4.63  4.65  4.66  4.56
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0  0  2 12  9  4.30  601/1579  4.30  4.26  4.08  4.07  4.30


                Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  2  2 20  4.75  454/1518  4.75  4.47  4.43  4.39  4.75
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  1  1 22  4.88  622/1520  4.88  4.87  4.70  4.68  4.88
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  2  3 19  4.71  360/1517  4.71  4.43  4.27  4.23  4.71
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  0  0  2  2 20  4.75  351/1550  4.75  4.24  4.22  4.20  4.75
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 16 0 0  2  1  5  4.38  368/1295  4.38  4.50  3.94  3.95  4.38


                Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0  2  1  2  4 10  4.00  770/1398  4.00  4.27  4.07  4.13  4.00
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0  0  1  0  3 15  4.68  471/1391  4.68  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.68
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0  0  0  3  3 13  4.53  631/1388  4.53  4.56  4.28  4.34  4.53
 4. Were special techniques successful                  7   5  0  0  0  3 11  4.79  107/ 958  4.79  4.13  3.93  3.97  4.79


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1      0.00-0.99    1        A   22        Required for Majors   0    Graduate      0      Major       24
 28-55      2      1.00-1.99    0        B    1                                                        
 56-83      5      2.00-2.99    1        C    1        General               0    Under-grad   26      Non-major    2
 84-150     4      3.00-3.49    3        D    0                                                        
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   10        F    0        Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                22
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ART  334  0101                University of Maryland                                   Page  136
Title        GRAPHIC DESIGN IV                   Baltimore County                                    FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   ABRAHAM, GUENET                       Fall   2007                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       32
Questionnaires: 31                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    2   0   0   4   5   4  16  4.10 1068/1639  4.10  4.45  4.27  4.28  4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     2   0   0   1   9   6  13  4.07 1044/1639  4.07  4.38  4.22  4.20  4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    2  25   0   0   1   1   2  4.25 ****/1397  ****  4.50  4.28  4.26  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     2   0   0   1   6   7  15  4.24  802/1583  4.24  4.50  4.19  4.24  4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  24   1   0   2   1   1  3.20 ****/1532  ****  3.99  4.01  4.05  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 11   7   5   3   0   3  2.28 1490/1504  2.28  3.89  4.05  4.12  2.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   4   5   7   6   3   4  2.76 1563/1612  2.76  4.05  4.16  4.12  2.76
8. How many times was class cancelled                  4   0   3   6   2  12   4  3.30 1607/1635  3.30  4.63  4.65  4.66  3.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6   1   0   0   5   9  10  4.21  714/1579  4.21  4.26  4.08  4.07  4.21

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4   0   0   1  10   9   7  3.81 1347/1518  3.81  4.47  4.43  4.39  3.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0   0   0   1   2  25  4.86  674/1520  4.86  4.87  4.70  4.68  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0   0   1   9   9   8  3.89 1193/1517  3.89  4.43  4.27  4.23  3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4   0   0   3   5   6  13  4.07 1043/1550  4.07  4.24  4.22  4.20  4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6  8   2   2   1   4   8  3.82  791/1295  3.82  4.50  3.94  3.95  3.82

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0   1   1   6   5  15  4.14  708/1398  4.14  4.27  4.07  4.13  4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0   0   1   3   6  18  4.46  647/1391  4.46  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0   0   2   3   6  17  4.36  771/1388  4.36  4.56  4.28  4.34  4.36
4. Were special techniques successful                  3  16   1   2   3   1   5  3.58  690/ 958  3.58  4.13  3.93  3.97  3.58

              Field Work
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      30   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  42  ****  5.00  4.75  4.63  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 30  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  50  ****  4.79  4.45  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     30   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  43  ****  5.00  4.69  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      30   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  3.67  4.37  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    30   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  5.00  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                 Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0        0.00-0.99    1      A    15        Required for Majors   0     Graduate      0      Major       21
 28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0      B     8                                                          
 56-83      1        2.00-2.99    0      C     1        General               0     Under-grad   31      Non-major   10
 84-150     7        3.00-3.49    7      D     0                                                          
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    5      F     0        Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P     0                                     responses to be significant
                                        I     0        Other                27
                                        ?     3
```

```
Course-Section: ART  335  0101              University of Maryland                        Page  137
Title       GRAPHIC DESIGN V                    Baltimore County                        FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: FAGAN, JASON                         Fall   2007                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    53
Questionnaires:  44                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level   Sect
             Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean      Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   4   0  1   0  10  14  15  4.05 1103/1639  4.05  4.45  4.27  4.28  4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    4   0  0   2   6  10  22  4.30  813/1639  4.30  4.38  4.22  4.20  4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   4   0  0   3   5   9  23  4.30  749/1397  4.30  4.50  4.28  4.26  4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    5  12  0   4   5   8  10  3.89 1171/1583  3.89  4.50  4.19  4.24  3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4   1  0   2   3   9  25  4.46  377/1532  4.46  3.99  4.01  4.05  4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5   4  2   7  10   6  10  3.43 1249/1504  3.43  3.89  4.05  4.12  3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            5   0  1   1   2   9  26  4.49  518/1612  4.49  4.05  4.16  4.12  4.49
8. How many times was class cancelled                  4   2  0   0   0   9  29  4.76  869/1635  4.76  4.63  4.65  4.66  4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9   0  0   3  11  14   7  3.71 1200/1579  3.71  4.26  4.08  4.07  3.71

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        5   0  0   1   4  12  22  4.41  933/1518  4.41  4.47  4.43  4.39  4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   4   0  1   0   3  11  25  4.47 1213/1520  4.48  4.87  4.70  4.68  4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4   0  1   2   6  11  20  4.18  964/1517  4.18  4.43  4.27  4.23  4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   2  1   2   5   9  22  4.26  897/1550  4.26  4.24  4.22  4.20  4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5   3  0   1   7   4  24  4.42  337/1295  4.42  4.50  3.94  3.95  4.42

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 19   0  6   4   5   3   7  3.04 1266/1398  3.04  4.27  4.07  4.13  3.04
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18   0  1   3   5   6  11  3.88 1076/1391  3.88  4.52  4.30  4.35  3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18   0  1   2   7   5  11  3.88 1043/1388  3.88  4.56  4.28  4.34  3.88
4. Were special techniques successful                  18  25  1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 958  ****  4.13  3.93  3.97  ****

                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                 Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1      0.00-0.99    0       A   14        Required for Majors   0     Graduate      0        Major       37
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0       B   14                                                           
  56-83      5      2.00-2.99    2       C    6        General               0     Under-grad   44        Non-major    7
  84-150    10      3.00-3.49    8       D    0                                                           
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    8       F    0        Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                38
                                         ?    5
```

| | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	2	19	4.63	482/1639	4.63	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	10	12	4.38	722/1639	4.38	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	6	15	4.48	512/1583	4.48	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	6	5	8	3.73	1081/1532	3.73	3.99	4.01	4.05	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	20	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1504	****	3.89	4.05	4.12	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	6	12	4.30	756/1612	4.30	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	840/1635	4.78	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	10	7	4.20	725/1579	4.20	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	1	7	13	4.35	1010/1518	4.35	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	750/1520	4.83	4.87	4.70	4.68	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	523/1517	4.57	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	568/1550	4.57	4.24	4.22	4.20	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	0	3	19	4.63	209/1295	4.63	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	5	5	9	3.95	828/1398	3.95	4.27	4.07	4.13	3.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	441/1391	4.71	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	328/1388	4.81	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.81
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	278/ 958	4.38	4.13	3.93	3.97	4.38

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	22
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	23	Non-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	1			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: ART  342  0101              University of Maryland                          Page  139
Title          FILM/VIDEO THEORY & CR        Baltimore County                              FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    WORDEN, FRED                      Fall   2007                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     13
Questionnaires: 10                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                               Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0  0  0  1  9  4.90  171/1639  4.90  4.45  4.27  4.28  4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0  0  0  2  8  4.80  199/1639  4.80  4.38  4.22  4.20  4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0  0  0  1  9  4.90  162/1397  4.90  4.50  4.28  4.26  4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0  0  0  3  7  4.70  299/1583  4.70  4.50  4.19  4.24  4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   0   0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1532  5.00  3.99  4.01  4.05  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0   0   0  0  0  3  7  4.70  222/1504  4.70  3.89  4.05  4.12  4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0  0  0  2  8  4.80  166/1612  4.80  4.05  4.16  4.12  4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0  0  0  1  9  4.90  662/1635  4.90  4.63  4.65  4.66  4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1   0   0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1579  5.00  4.26  4.08  4.07  5.00


                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0  0  0  2  8  4.80  360/1518  4.80  4.47  4.43  4.39  4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1520  5.00  4.87  4.70  4.68  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0  0  0  2  8  4.80  239/1517  4.80  4.43  4.27  4.23  4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0  0  0  1  9  4.90  174/1550  4.90  4.24  4.22  4.20  4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0   0   0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1295  5.00  4.50  3.94  3.95  5.00


                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  0   0   0  0  0  3  7  4.70  309/1398  4.70  4.27  4.07  4.13  4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  0   0   0  0  0  1  9  4.90  227/1391  4.90  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0   0   0  0  0  1  9  4.90  224/1388  4.90  4.56  4.28  4.34  4.90
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   1   0  0  1  4  4  4.33  307/ 958  4.33  4.13  3.93  3.97  4.33


                                       Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ART  346   0101              University of Maryland                        Page  140
Title      VIDEO II                          Baltimore County                             FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   GRABILL, VIN                      Fall   2007                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    15
Questionnaires:  12                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                       Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0  0  1  3  5  2 3.73 1378/1639  3.73  4.45  4.27  4.28  3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  0  0  2  4  5 4.27  840/1639  4.27  4.38  4.22  4.20  4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   4  0  1  2  2  2 3.71 1195/1397  3.71  4.50  4.28  4.26  3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   1  0  0  1  3  6 4.50  476/1583  4.50  4.50  4.19  4.24  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   5  2  1  0  1  2 3.00 1421/1532  3.00  3.99  4.01  4.05  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1  1  0  3  1  5 3.90  945/1504  3.90  3.89  4.05  4.12  3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   1  0  0  2  5  3 4.10  976/1612  4.10  4.05  4.16  4.12  4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  3  8 4.73  928/1635  4.73  4.63  4.65  4.66  4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  0  1  5  3 4.22  691/1579  4.22  4.26  4.08  4.07  4.22


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  2  3  5 4.30 1053/1518  4.30  4.47  4.43  4.39  4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  0  1  9 4.90  546/1520  4.90  4.87  4.70  4.68  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  2  4  4 4.20  947/1517  4.20  4.43  4.27  4.23  4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  0  0  2  4  4 4.20  944/1550  4.20  4.24  4.22  4.20  4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0  0  0  1  1  8 4.70  167/1295  4.70  4.50  3.94  3.95  4.70


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  1  1  3  1  4 3.60 1074/1398  3.60  4.27  4.07  4.13  3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  1  0  1  8 4.60  543/1391  4.60  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0  0  0  3  7 4.70  459/1388  4.70  4.56  4.28  4.34  4.70
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   6  2  0  0  1  1 2.75  895/ 958  2.75  4.13  3.93  3.97  2.75


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0        A    6      Required for Majors  0    Graduate      0    Major      10
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0        B    5
  56-83      1      2.00-2.99   1        C    0      General              2    Under-grad   12    Non-major   2
  84-150     3      3.00-3.49   2        D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   2        F    0      Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other                8
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ART  350  0101              University of Maryland                                          Page  141
Title      CONSTRUCTED ENVIRONMEN            Baltimore County                                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  DURANT, MARK                    Fall   2007                                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     18
Questionnaires:  10                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                 Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0   0   0   1   1   7  4.67   430/1639  4.67  4.45  4.27  4.28  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0   0   0   0   4   5  4.56   466/1639  4.56  4.38  4.22  4.20  4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    2   5   0   0   0   1   2  4.67   367/1397  4.67  4.50  4.28  4.26  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   1   0   0   1   1   6  4.63   355/1583  4.63  4.50  4.19  4.24  4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   2   1   0   2   2   2  3.57  1201/1532  3.57  3.99  4.01  4.05  3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  7   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/1504  ****  3.89  4.05  4.12  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   5   0   1   1   1   1  3.50  1399/1612  3.50  4.05  4.16  4.12  3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1   0   0   0   1   8  4.89   691/1635  4.89  4.63  4.65  4.66  4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0   0   0   1   3   5  4.44   450/1579  4.44  4.26  4.08  4.07  4.44


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0   0   0   1   1   7  4.67   602/1518  4.67  4.47  4.43  4.39  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0   0   0   0   1   8  4.89   597/1520  4.89  4.87  4.70  4.68  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   0   0   0   3   6  4.67   405/1517  4.67  4.43  4.27  4.23  4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   1   0   0   1   1   7  4.67   457/1550  4.67  4.24  4.22  4.20  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  2   0   0   0   2   5  4.71   155/1295  4.71  4.50  3.94  3.95  4.71


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5   0   0   0   0   2   3  4.60   369/1398  4.60  4.27  4.07  4.13  4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5   0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80   332/1391  4.80  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80   328/1388  4.80  4.56  4.28  4.34  4.80
4. Were special techniques successful                   5   2   0   0   0   1   2  4.67   155/ 958  4.67  4.13  3.93  3.97  4.67


                           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       9
  28-55     0      1.00-1.99    0       B    1
  56-83     0      2.00-2.99    1       C    0       General              0     Under-grad   10     Non-major   1
  84-150    1      3.00-3.49    1       D    0
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    0       F    0       Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                9
                                        ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ART  351  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  142
Title      BLACK & WHITE PHOTO            Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  SILBERG, STEVEN (Instr. A)       Fall   2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    16
Questionnaires:  16                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean   Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   4   0   0   0   0   2  10  4.83  231/1639  4.83  4.45  4.27  4.28  4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    4   0   0   0   1   2   9  4.67  349/1639  4.67  4.38  4.22  4.20  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   4   2   0   0   2   1   7  4.50  517/1397  4.50  4.50  4.28  4.26  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    4   0   0   0   0   3   9  4.75  239/1583  4.75  4.50  4.19  4.24  4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5  0   2   0   0   5   4  3.82  981/1532  3.82  3.99  4.01  4.05  3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5 0  0   1   3   3   4  3.91  945/1504  3.91  3.89  4.05  4.12  3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            5   0   0   1   1   2   7  4.36  681/1612  4.36  4.05  4.16  4.12  4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled                  4   1   0   0   0   4   7  4.64 1034/1635  4.64  4.63  4.65  4.66  4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0  0   0   0   3   6  4.67  241/1579  4.67  4.26  4.08  4.07  4.67


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        5   0   0   0   0   4   7  4.64  643/1518  4.64  4.47  4.43  4.39  4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   5   0   0   0   0   1  10  4.91  546/1520  4.91  4.87  4.70  4.68  4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0   0   0   0   5   7  4.58  498/1517  4.58  4.43  4.27  4.23  4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0   0   1   1   2   9  4.46  690/1550  3.23  4.24  4.22  4.20  3.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 1  0   0   2   4   3  4.11  569/1295  4.11  4.50  3.94  3.95  4.11


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0   0   0   0   4   8  4.67  329/1398  4.67  4.27  4.07  4.13  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0   0   0   0   1  11  4.92  204/1391  4.92  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0  0   0   1   4  10  4.60  571/1388  4.60  4.56  4.28  4.34  4.60
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   6   0   0   2   3   1  3.83  563/ 958  3.83  4.13  3.93  3.97  3.83


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades       Reasons              Type                 Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0      0.00-0.99   1        A    7       Required for Majors  1    Graduate    0       Major      11
  28-55     2      1.00-1.99   0        B    4
  56-83     3      2.00-2.99   0        C    0       General         4    Under-grad  16       Non-major   5
  84-150    2      3.00-3.49   4        D    0
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   7        F    0       Electives       0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                           responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other           7
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ART  351  0101            University of Maryland                          Page  143
Title      BLACK & WHITE PHOTO              Baltimore County                            FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:            (Instr. B)              Fall   2007                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      16
Questionnaires:  16                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   4   0  0  0  0  2  10  4.83   231/1639  4.83  4.45  4.27  4.28  4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    4   0  0  0  1  2   9  4.67   349/1639  4.67  4.38  4.22  4.20  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   4   2  0  0  2  1   7  4.50   517/1397  4.50  4.50  4.28  4.26  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    4   0  0  0  0  3   9  4.75   239/1583  4.75  4.50  4.19  4.24  4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5   0  2  0  0  5   4  3.82   981/1532  3.82  3.99  4.01  4.05  3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5  0  0  1  3  3   4  3.91   945/1504  3.91  3.89  4.05  4.12  3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            5   0  0  1  1  2   7  4.36   681/1612  4.36  4.05  4.16  4.12  4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled                  4   1  0  0  0  4   7  4.64  1034/1635  4.64  4.63  4.65  4.66  4.64

                Lecture
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    11   1  0  4  0  0   0  2.00  1518/1550  3.23  4.24  4.22  4.20  3.23


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0  0  0  0  4   8  4.67   329/1398  4.67  4.27  4.07  4.13  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0  0  0  0  1  11  4.92   204/1391  4.92  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  1  4  10  4.60   571/1388  4.60  4.56  4.28  4.34  4.60
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   6  0  0  2  3   1  3.83   563/ 958  3.83  4.13  3.93  3.97  3.83

                         Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                     Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0         0.00-0.99   1       A   7         Required for Majors  1     Graduate     0        Major       11
  28-55     2         1.00-1.99   0       B   4
  56-83     3         2.00-2.99   0       C   0         General              4     Under-grad  16        Non-major    5
  84-150    2         3.00-3.49   4       D   0
  Grad.     0         3.50-4.00   7       F   0         Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P   0                                    responses to be significant
                                          I   0         Other                7
                                          ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ART  353  0101               University of Maryland                           Page  144
Title         COLOR PHOTOGRAPHY               Baltimore County                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   PEREGOY, CHRIST                 Fall   2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:        9
Questionnaires:    9                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                       Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0  0  0  1  2  5  4.50   615/1639   4.50  4.45  4.27  4.28  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63   393/1639   4.63  4.38  4.22  4.20  4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2   5  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/1397   ****  4.50  4.28  4.26  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  0  1  0  7  4.75   239/1583   4.75  4.50  4.19  4.24  4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  3  0  5  4.25   580/1532   4.25  3.99  4.01  4.05  4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2 2 0 1 1 2  3.17  1371/1504   3.17  3.89  4.05  4.12  3.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  1  1  0  6  4.38   669/1612   4.38  4.05  4.16  4.12  4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63  1045/1635   4.63  4.63  4.65  4.66  4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 2 5  4.71   205/1579   4.71  4.26  4.08  4.07  4.71


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  1  0  1  6  4.50   807/1518   4.50  4.47  4.43  4.39  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88   622/1520   4.88  4.87  4.70  4.68  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  1  0  7  4.75   299/1517   4.75  4.43  4.27  4.23  4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  1  0  0  7  4.63   500/1550   4.63  4.24  4.22  4.20  4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 2 6  4.75   135/1295   4.75  4.50  3.94  3.95  4.75


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  1  1  6  4.63   355/1398   4.63  4.27  4.07  4.13  4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  1  1  6  4.63   525/1391   4.63  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 2 0 6  4.50   647/1388   4.50  4.56  4.28  4.34  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   4  1  1  0  1  1  3.00   841/ 958   3.00  4.13  3.93  3.97  3.00

               Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  8   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 224   ****  4.96  4.10  4.06  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00  ****/ 240   ****  4.60  4.11  4.08  ****


                                      Frequency Distribution

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

```
                                              Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1  0  0  0  0  0  8 5.00    1/1639  5.00  4.45  4.27  4.28  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  0  0  1  7 4.88  149/1639  4.88  4.38  4.22  4.20  4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  4  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1397  5.00  4.50  4.28  4.26  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  0  0  0  2  1  5 4.38  640/1583  4.38  4.50  4.19  4.24  4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  4  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1532  5.00  3.99  4.01  4.05  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 6 0 0  0  0  2 5.00 ****/1504  ****  3.89  4.05  4.12  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  0  2  0  6 4.50  490/1612  4.50  4.05  4.16  4.12  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  1  0  0  0  0  8 5.00    1/1635  5.00  4.63  4.65  4.66  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0  2  6 4.75  175/1579  4.75  4.26  4.08  4.07  4.75

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  0  0  8 5.00    1/1518  5.00  4.47  4.43  4.39  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  0  8 5.00    1/1520  5.00  4.87  4.70  4.68  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  2  6 4.75  299/1517  4.75  4.43  4.27  4.23  4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  0  0  0  8 5.00    1/1550  5.00  4.24  4.22  4.20  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 1 0  0  2  5 4.25  459/1295  4.25  4.50  3.94  3.95  4.25

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0  2  1  4 4.29  599/1398  4.29  4.27  4.07  4.13  4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0  1  3  4 4.38  719/1391  4.38  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0  2  6 4.75  387/1388  4.75  4.56  4.28  4.34  4.75
4. Were special techniques successful                  1  5  0  0  0  1  2 4.67  155/ 958  4.67  4.13  3.93  3.97  4.67

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  8  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 224  ****  4.96  4.10  4.06  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 0 0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 240  ****  4.60  4.11  4.08  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 0 0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 219  ****  2.29  4.44  4.44  ****

                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 8 0 0 0 0  0  1 5.00 ****/  85  ****  4.75  4.58  4.50  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 8 0 0 0 0  0  1 5.00 ****/  82  ****  5.00  4.52  4.59  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  78  ****  4.83  4.47  4.60  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    8  0  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/  80  ****  4.75  4.47  4.65  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                8  0  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/  82  ****  4.63  4.16  4.08  ****

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  52  ****  4.67  4.04  4.78  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 8  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  53  ****  3.87  4.05  4.31  ****

                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0  0  1 5.00 ****/  50  ****  4.79  4.45  5.00  ****
```

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	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	9	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	6				

```
Course-Section: ART  359  0101              University of Maryland                            Page  146
Title          TOPICS IN PHOTOGRAPHY        Baltimore County                                 FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    THOMPSON, CALLA              Fall   2007                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    11
Questionnaires: 11                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   2   0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  188/1639  4.89  4.45  4.27  4.28  4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2   0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  142/1639  4.89  4.38  4.22  4.20  4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2   5  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1397  5.00  4.50  4.28  4.26  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1583  5.00  4.50  4.19  4.24  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  1  1  7  4.67  236/1532  4.67  3.99  4.01  4.05  4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  1 0  0  0  3  5  4.63  275/1504  4.63  3.89  4.05  4.12  4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  123/1612  4.89  4.05  4.16  4.12  4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled                  3   0  0  0  0  8  0  4.00 1497/1635  4.00  4.63  4.65  4.66  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1579  5.00  4.26  4.08  4.07  5.00


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  257/1518  4.88  4.47  4.43  4.39  4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1520  5.00  4.87  4.70  4.68  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1517  5.00  4.43  4.27  4.23  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   1  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  208/1550  4.88  4.24  4.22  4.20  4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1295  5.00  4.50  3.94  3.95  5.00


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  172/1398  4.89  4.27  4.07  4.13  4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1391  5.00  4.52  4.30  4.35  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  224/1388  4.90  4.56  4.28  4.34  4.90
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   2  0  0  0  1  6  4.86   87/ 958  4.86  4.13  3.93  3.97  4.86


                                    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      7
 28-55    0        1.00-1.99   0        B    5
 56-83    0        2.00-2.99   0        C    0        General         1      Under-grad  11     Non-major  4
 84-150   1        3.00-3.49   1        D    0
 Grad.    0        3.50-4.00   1        F    0        Electives       0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                              responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other           8
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ART  360  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  147
Title         MIXED MEDIA BOOK ARTS         Baltimore County                                 FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   CHAN, IRENE Y.                   Fall   2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      14
Questionnaires:  11                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82  248/1639  4.82  4.45  4.27  4.28  4.82
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  5  5  4.36  735/1639  4.36  4.38  4.22  4.20  4.36
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  10  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1397  ****  4.50  4.28  4.26  ****
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  4  6  4.45  536/1583  4.45  4.50  4.19  4.24  4.45
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  2  1  3  1  3  3.20 1378/1532  3.20  3.99  4.01  4.05  3.20
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  1  2  1  1  4  1  3.11 1388/1504  3.11  3.89  4.05  4.12  3.11
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  1  2  5  2  3.80 1253/1612  3.80  4.05  4.16  4.12  3.80
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0 10  1  4.09 1458/1635  4.09  4.63  4.65  4.66  4.09
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0  0  0  1  6  2  4.11  818/1579  4.11  4.26  4.08  4.07  4.11


              Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  213/1518  4.90  4.47  4.43  4.39  4.90
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1520  5.00  4.87  4.70  4.68  5.00
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  4  6  4.60  474/1517  4.60  4.43  4.27  4.23  4.60
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  0  0  0  4  5  4.56  580/1550  4.56  4.24  4.22  4.20  4.56
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0  0  0  0  3  6  4.67  185/1295  4.67  4.50  3.94  3.95  4.67


              Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  1  4  5  4.40  511/1398  4.40  4.27  4.07  4.13  4.40
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  332/1391  4.80  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.80
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  328/1388  4.80  4.56  4.28  4.34  4.80
 4. Were special techniques successful                  1   3  0  0  1  4  2  4.14  411/ 958  4.14  4.13  3.93  3.97  4.14


                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ART  382  0101              University of Maryland                         Page  148
Title       INTERACTIVITY                      Baltimore County                            FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    CRAWFORD, BONNI                    Fall   2007                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     13
Questionnaires:  10                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   1   0   2   7  4.50  615/1639  4.50  4.45  4.27  4.28  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   2   2   6  4.40  684/1639  4.40  4.38  4.22  4.20  4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   6   0   0   0   0   4  5.00    1/1397  5.00  4.50  4.28  4.26  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   4   6  4.60  371/1583  4.60  4.50  4.19  4.24  4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   1   4   5  4.40  441/1532  4.40  3.99  4.01  4.05  4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5  0   0   1   0   4  4.60  291/1504  4.60  3.89  4.05  4.12  4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   1   0   1   8  4.60  388/1612  4.60  4.05  4.16  4.12  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0  10  5.00    1/1635  5.00  4.63  4.65  4.66  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0   0   0   2   4  4.67  241/1579  4.67  4.26  4.08  4.07  4.67

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   0   1   2   6  4.56  745/1518  4.56  4.47  4.43  4.39  4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   0   1   8  4.89  597/1520  4.89  4.87  4.70  4.68  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   0   1   2   6  4.56  535/1517  4.56  4.43  4.27  4.23  4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0   0   2   2   5  4.33  832/1550  4.33  4.24  4.22  4.20  4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0  0   0   0   3   6  4.67  185/1295  4.67  4.50  3.94  3.95  4.67

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0   0   0   1   1   4  4.50  426/1398  4.50  4.27  4.07  4.13  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0   0   0   0   2   4  4.67  489/1391  4.67  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0  0   0   0   2   4  4.67  496/1388  4.67  4.56  4.28  4.34  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   0   0   0   1   2   3  4.33  307/ 958  4.33  4.13  3.93  3.97  4.33


                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type               Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0        A    4       Required for Majors   0    Graduate      0     Major       7
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0        B    3
  56-83      0      2.00-2.99    0        C    0       General               2    Under-grad   10     Non-major   3
  84-150     3      3.00-3.49    1        D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    1        F    0       Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                 5
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ART  384  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 149
Title     COMPUTER ANIMATION                  Baltimore County                             FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  MCDONALD, NEAL                     Fall   2007                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    16
Questionnaires:  11                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82  248/1639  4.82  4.45  4.27  4.28  4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  3  2  6  4.27  840/1639  4.27  4.38  4.22  4.20  4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  3  1  7  4.36  696/1397  4.36  4.50  4.28  4.26  4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  2  3  6  4.36  654/1583  4.36  4.50  4.19  4.24  4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  9  0  1  0  1  0  3.00 ****/1532  ****  3.99  4.01  4.05  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 2 2 4 2  3.60 1154/1504  3.60  3.89  4.05  4.12  3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained          0   0  0  1  3  2  5  4.00 1044/1612  4.00  4.05  4.16  4.12  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                0   0  0  0  0  3  8  4.73  928/1635  4.73  4.63  4.65  4.66  4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 1 1 6  4.63  269/1579  4.63  4.26  4.08  4.07  4.63


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared      1   0  0  1  1  2  6  4.30 1053/1518  4.30  4.47  4.43  4.39  4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1   0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1520  5.00  4.87  4.70  4.68  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 2 3 4  4.22  917/1517  4.22  4.43  4.27  4.23  4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned   1   0  0  0  1  1  8  4.70  424/1550  4.70  4.24  4.22  4.20  4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 0 1 1 7  4.67  185/1295  4.67  4.50  3.94  3.95  4.67


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 1 3 5  4.44  477/1398  4.44  4.27  4.07  4.13  4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0 0 4 5  4.56  579/1391  4.56  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.44  702/1388  4.44  4.56  4.28  4.34  4.44
4. Were special techniques successful                2   0  0  0  1  2  6  4.56  190/ 958  4.56  4.13  3.93  3.97  4.56


                              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       9
  28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0        B    1
  56-83      4       2.00-2.99    2        C    2        General              0     Under-grad   11     Non-major   2
  84-150     1       3.00-3.49    1        D    0
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    2        F    0        Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                          I    0        Other               11
                                          ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ART  389  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page  150
Title         TOPICS IN COMPUTER ART          Baltimore County                                       FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   DYER, ERIC G                     Fall   2007                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     10
Questionnaires: 10                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank     Mean  Mean   Mean Mean   Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0  0  0  2  1  6  4.44  698/1639  4.44  4.45  4.27  4.28  4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  0  0  1  4  4  4.33  774/1639  4.33  4.38  4.22  4.20  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   1  0  2  4  1  1  3.13 1349/1397  3.13  4.50  4.28  4.26  3.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   0  0  0  2  2  5  4.33  697/1583  4.33  4.50  4.19  4.24  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  1  0  4  3  1  3.33 1330/1532  3.33  3.99  4.01  4.05  3.33
6. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   1  1  0  4  2  1  3.25 1474/1612  3.25  4.05  4.16  4.12  3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1635  5.00  4.63  4.65  4.66  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  0  1  2  4  4.43  473/1579  4.43  4.26  4.08  4.07  4.43


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  1  4  4  4.33 1021/1518  4.33  4.47  4.43  4.39  4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1520  5.00  4.87  4.70  4.68  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  0  2  2  4  4.25  886/1517  4.25  4.43  4.27  4.23  4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  1  2  4  2  3.78 1228/1550  3.78  4.24  4.22  4.20  3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  0  0  0  1  2  6  4.56  243/1295  4.56  4.50  3.94  3.95  4.56


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5   0  0  1  1  1  2  3.80  929/1398  3.80  4.27  4.07  4.13  3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5   0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60  543/1391  4.60  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  647/1388  4.50  4.56  4.28  4.34  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                   5   2  0  1  0  0  2  4.00  456/ 958  4.00  4.13  3.93  3.97  4.00


                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type               Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0        A    5       Required for Majors  0    Graduate      0      Major        9
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0        B    3
  56-83      1      2.00-2.99   1        C    0       General              7    Under-grad   10      Non-major    1
  84-150     4      3.00-3.49   5        D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   1        F    0       Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                2
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ART  389C 0101            University of Maryland                              Page  151
Title       SOUND DESIGN                   Baltimore County                                  FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  BELL, KATHRYN L                   Fall   2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     16
Questionnaires:  12                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0  2  2  4  4  3.83 1303/1639  3.83  4.45  4.27  4.28  3.83
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0  0  0  4  8  4.67  349/1639  4.67  4.38  4.22  4.20  4.67
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   9   0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1397  ****  4.50  4.28  4.26  ****
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0  0  1  4  7  4.50  476/1583  4.50  4.50  4.19  4.24  4.50
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   6   0  0  4  2  0  3.33 1330/1532  3.33  3.99  4.01  4.05  3.33
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 8   0  0  1  2  1  4.00  824/1504  4.00  3.89  4.05  4.12  4.00
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   2   0  1  3  4  2  3.70 1305/1612  3.70  4.05  4.16  4.12  3.70
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0  0  0  8  4  4.33 1288/1635  4.33  4.63  4.65  4.66  4.33
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  0  0  1  4  3  4.25  657/1579  4.25  4.26  4.08  4.07  4.25


              Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0  0  0  6  6  4.50  807/1518  4.50  4.47  4.43  4.39  4.50
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0  0  0  0 12  5.00    1/1520  5.00  4.87  4.70  4.68  5.00
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0  0  1  4  7  4.50  597/1517  4.50  4.43  4.27  4.23  4.50
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0  0  0  7  5  4.42  755/1550  4.42  4.24  4.22  4.20  4.42
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0   0  0  0  1 10  4.91   82/1295  4.91  4.50  3.94  3.95  4.91


              Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0   0  0  2  4  4  4.20  675/1398  4.20  4.27  4.07  4.13  4.20
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0   0  0  0  1  9  4.90  227/1391  4.90  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.90
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70  459/1388  4.70  4.56  4.28  4.34  4.70
 4. Were special techniques successful                  2   7   1  0  0  1  1  3.33  786/ 958  3.33  4.13  3.93  3.97  3.33


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA       Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                 Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0       A    6       Required for Majors  0    Graduate     0      Major       9
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0       B    6
  56-83      2      2.00-2.99   3       C    0       General          4    Under-grad   12      Non-major   3
  84-150     3      3.00-3.49   1       D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   3       F    0       Electives        0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                            responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other            7
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ART  392  0101                    University of Maryland                              Page  152
Title          TOPICS IN ART OR MEDIA             Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    ROSENBERG, JASO                    Fall   2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       8
Questionnaires:   6                           Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean   Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                       General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1639   5.00  4.45  4.27  4.28  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  349/1639   4.67  4.38  4.22  4.20  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   5  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1397   ****  4.50  4.28  4.26  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  323/1583   4.67  4.50  4.19  4.24  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  3  0  3  4.00  774/1532   4.00  3.99  4.01  4.05  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0   4  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  367/1504   4.50  3.89  4.05  4.12  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  3  0  2  1  3.17 1497/1612   3.17  4.05  4.16  4.12  3.17
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1635   5.00  4.63  4.65  4.66  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  175/1579   4.75  4.26  4.08  4.07  4.75


                       Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  315/1518   4.83  4.47  4.43  4.39  4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1520   5.00  4.87  4.70  4.68  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  405/1517   4.67  4.43  4.27  4.23  4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1550   5.00  4.24  4.22  4.20  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1295   5.00  4.50  3.94  3.95  5.00


                       Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1398   5.00  4.27  4.07  4.13  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  332/1391   4.80  4.52  4.30  4.35  4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1388   5.00  4.56  4.28  4.34  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   3  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/ 958   5.00  4.13  3.93  3.97  5.00


                                        Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ART  392C 0101            University of Maryland                            Page  153
Title       INNOVATION AND DESIGN              Baltimore County                            FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  YAGER, DAVID                        Fall   2007                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     8
Questionnaires:  6                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  615/1639  4.50  4.45  4.27  4.28  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  0  1  4  0  3.33 1536/1639  3.33  4.38  4.22  4.20  3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  186/1583  4.80  4.50  4.19  4.24  4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  4  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1504  5.00  3.89  4.05  4.12  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   3  1  1  1  0  0  2.00 1595/1612  2.00  4.05  4.16  4.12  2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67 1001/1635  4.67  4.63  4.65  4.66  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  0  0  0  0  1  4  1  4.00  889/1579  4.00  4.26  4.08  4.07  4.00

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  684/1518  4.60  4.47  4.43  4.39  4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1520  5.00  4.87  4.70  4.68  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  239/1517  4.80  4.43  4.27  4.23  4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  288/1550  4.80  4.24  4.22  4.20  4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  109/1295  4.80  4.50  3.94  3.95  4.80

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  3  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1398  5.00  4.27  4.07  4.13  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  3  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1391  5.00  4.52  4.30  4.35  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1388  5.00  4.56  4.28  4.34  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   3  1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  201/ 958  4.50  4.13  3.93  3.97  4.50

                              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       3
 28-55      0       1.00-1.99   0       B   1
 56-83      0       2.00-2.99   0       C   0      General              3     Under-grad    6      Non-major   3
 84-150     3       3.00-3.49   0       D   0
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   4       F   0      Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                responses to be significant
                                        I   0      Other                1
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ART  423  0101              University of Maryland                          Page  154
Title        ART SINCE 1945                  Baltimore County                             FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  JACOB, PREMINDA                    Fall   2007                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      10
Questionnaires:   8                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63  482/1639  4.63  4.45  4.27  4.42  4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  4  4  4.50  517/1639  4.50  4.38  4.22  4.29  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  4  4  4.50  517/1397  4.50  4.50  4.28  4.38  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  2  1  5  4.38  640/1583  4.38  4.50  4.19  4.31  4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63  262/1532  4.63  3.99  4.01  4.07  4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  2  2  4  4.25  612/1504  4.25  3.89  4.05  4.20  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  2  2  4  4.25  814/1612  4.25  4.05  4.16  4.18  4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1635  5.00  4.63  4.65  4.72  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  128/1579  4.83  4.26  4.08  4.21  4.83

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1518  5.00  4.47  4.43  4.51  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  674/1520  4.86  4.87  4.70  4.75  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1517  5.00  4.43  4.27  4.34  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  1  1  5  4.57  556/1550  4.57  4.24  4.22  4.24  4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86   95/1295  4.86  4.50  3.94  4.01  4.86

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  217/1398  4.80  4.27  4.07  4.23  4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  0  0  3  2  4.40  694/1391  4.40  4.52  4.30  4.48  4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  571/1388  4.60  4.56  4.28  4.50  4.60
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   3  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  201/ 958  4.50  4.13  3.93  4.24  4.50


                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                    Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0         A    6          Required for Majors   0      Graduate       0        Major        7
  28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0         B    2
  56-83      1       2.00-2.99    0         C    0          General               1      Under-grad     8        Non-major    1
  84-150     5       3.00-3.49    3         D    0
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    4         F    0          Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    0                                       responses to be significant
                                            I    0          Other                 7
                                            ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ART  425  0101              University of Maryland                              Page  155
Title         WRIT BY & ABOUT ARTIST          Baltimore County                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   MAHONEY, JAMES  (Instr. A)          Fall   2007                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      4
Questionnaires:  2                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0  0  0  1  1 4.50  615/1639  4.50  4.45  4.27 4.42  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0  0  0  1  1 4.50  517/1639  4.50  4.38  4.22 4.29  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   1   0  0  0  1  0 4.00  973/1397  4.00  4.50  4.28 4.38  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1583  5.00  4.50  4.19 4.31  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0  0  0  1  1 4.50  335/1532  4.50  3.99  4.01 4.07  4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0   0  0  0  1  1 4.50  367/1504  4.50  3.89  4.05 4.20  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0  0  0  2  0 4.00 1044/1612  4.00  4.05  4.16 4.18  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1635  5.00  4.63  4.65 4.72  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  0  0  1  1 4.50  382/1579  4.50  4.26  4.08 4.21  4.50


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0  0  0  1  1 4.50  807/1518  4.50  4.47  4.43 4.51  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1520  5.00  4.87  4.70 4.75  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1517  5.00  4.43  4.27 4.34  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1550  3.50  4.24  4.22 4.24  3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  0  0  0  1  1 4.50  265/1295  4.50  4.50  3.94 4.01  4.50


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1398  5.00  4.27  4.07 4.23  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1391  5.00  4.52  4.30 4.48  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1388  5.00  4.56  4.28 4.50  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   0   0  0  0  1  1 4.50  201/ 958  4.50  4.13  3.93 4.24  4.50


                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ART  425  0101              University of Maryland                              Page  156
Title       WRIT BY & ABOUT ARTIST             Baltimore County                              FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:                 (Instr. D)            Fall   2007                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      4
Questionnaires:  2                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions             NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50   615/1639  4.50  4.45  4.27  4.42  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50   517/1639  4.50  4.38  4.22  4.29  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00   973/1397  4.00  4.50  4.28  4.38  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00     1/1583  5.00  4.50  4.19  4.31  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50   335/1532  4.50  3.99  4.01  4.07  4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   0   0   1   1  4.50   367/1504  4.50  3.89  4.05  4.20  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   0   2   0  4.00  1044/1612  4.00  4.05  4.16  4.18  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00     1/1635  5.00  4.63  4.65  4.72  5.00


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00     1/1398  5.00  4.27  4.07  4.23  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00     1/1391  5.00  4.52  4.30  4.48  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  0   0   0   0   2  5.00     1/1388  5.00  4.56  4.28  4.50  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50   201/ 958  4.50  4.13  3.93  4.24  4.50

                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ART  430  0101              University of Maryland                          Page  157
Title       GRAPHIC DESIGN VI                   Baltimore County                           FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  RE, PEGGY                            Fall   2007                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    22
Questionnaires: 13                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                   General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0  0  0  0  2 10  4.83   231/1639   4.83  4.45  4.27  4.42  4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  3  9  4.75   252/1639   4.75  4.38  4.22  4.29  4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   9  0  0  1  0  2  4.33  ****/1397   ****  4.50  4.28  4.38  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  0  1  2  9  4.67   323/1583   4.67  4.50  4.19  4.31  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  6  0  0  2  1  3  4.17   655/1532   4.17  3.99  4.01  4.07  4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2 0 0 2 1 7  4.50   367/1504   4.50  3.89  4.05  4.20  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0  0  0  2  3  6  4.36   681/1612   4.36  4.05  4.16  4.18  4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  1  4  7  4.50  1135/1635   4.50  4.63  4.65  4.72  4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 3 9  4.75   175/1579   4.75  4.26  4.08  4.21  4.75

                   Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80   360/1518   4.80  4.47  4.43  4.51  4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90   546/1520   4.90  4.87  4.70  4.75  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  0  1  1  8  4.70   371/1517   4.70  4.43  4.27  4.34  4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0  1  0  1  1  7  4.30   860/1550   4.30  4.24  4.22  4.24  4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 4 0 0 0 2 3  4.60   221/1295   4.60  4.50  3.94  4.01  4.60

                   Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78   242/1398   4.78  4.27  4.07  4.23  4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  0  0  1  1  7  4.67   489/1391   4.67  4.52  4.30  4.48  4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 3 7  4.70   459/1388   4.70  4.56  4.28  4.50  4.70
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   0  0  1  0  2  6  4.44   240/ 958   4.44  4.13  3.93  4.24  4.44
```

```
                                       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      1     Major        7
 28-55      0       1.00-1.99   0        B    1
 56-83      0       2.00-2.99   0        C    1          General               0    Under-grad   12     Non-major    6
 84-150     3       3.00-3.49   5        D    0
 Grad.      1       3.50-4.00   2        F    0          Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                         I    0          Other                11
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ART  431  0101              University of Maryland                            Page  158
Title      GRAPHIC DESIGN VII               Baltimore County                                 FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  COATES, JOSEPH                 Fall   2007                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     13
Questionnaires:  13              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                  Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0  2  2  3  4  1 3.00 1599/1639  3.00  4.45  4.27  4.42  3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  1  3  6  1  1 2.83 1609/1639  2.83  4.38  4.22  4.29  2.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  11  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/1397  ****  4.50  4.28  4.38  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   3  1  0  3  4  1 3.44 1431/1583  3.44  4.50  4.19  4.31  3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  11  0  1  0  0  0 2.00 ****/1532  ****  3.99  4.01  4.07  ****
6. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   3  3  3  2  1  0 2.11 1594/1612  2.11  4.05  4.16  4.18  2.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  9  3 4.25 1350/1635  4.25  4.63  4.65  4.72  4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  1  4  5  1  1 2.75 1531/1579  2.75  4.26  4.08  4.21  2.75


                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  4  2  4  1  0 2.18 1509/1518  2.18  4.47  4.43  4.51  2.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  2  2  5  3 3.75 1465/1520  3.75  4.87  4.70  4.75  3.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  3  2  5  1  0 2.36 1505/1517  2.36  4.43  4.27  4.34  2.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  5  1  5  1  0 2.17 1514/1550  2.17  4.24  4.22  4.24  2.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1  3  2  3  2  1 2.64 1233/1295  2.64  4.50  3.94  4.01  2.64


                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  3  2  3  3  0 2.55 1353/1398  2.55  4.27  4.07  4.23  2.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  2  3  4  2 3.55 1208/1391  3.55  4.52  4.30  4.48  3.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0  1  2  3  2  4 3.50 1185/1388  3.50  4.56  4.28  4.50  3.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   9  1  0  0  1  0 2.50 ****/ 958  ****  4.13  3.93  4.24  ****


                              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    1      Major       10
  28-55      0     1.00-1.99   0      B    1
  56-83      0     2.00-2.99   0      C    1    General               0     Under-grad 12      Non-major    3
  84-150     4     3.00-3.49   4      D    0
  Grad.      1     3.50-4.00   3      F    0    Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                               responses to be significant
                                      I    0    Other                12
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ART  435A 0101           University of Maryland                              Page  159
Title           DOC. CINEMA IN 21ST CE   Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:     WORDEN, FRED             Fall  2007                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      11
Questionnaires:  10                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1639  5.00  4.45  4.27  4.42  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  231/1639  4.78  4.38  4.22  4.29  4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   6  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1397  5.00  4.50  4.28  4.38  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  151/1583  4.89  4.50  4.19  4.31  4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  3  2  4  4.11  692/1532  4.11  3.99  4.01  4.07  4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  1  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  182/1504  4.75  3.89  4.05  4.20  4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  0  3  6  4.67  317/1612  4.67  4.05  4.16  4.18  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1635  5.00  4.63  4.65  4.72  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1579  5.00  4.26  4.08  4.21  5.00


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  416/1518  4.78  4.47  4.43  4.51  4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1520  5.00  4.87  4.70  4.75  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  275/1517  4.78  4.43  4.27  4.34  4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  325/1550  4.78  4.24  4.22  4.24  4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1295  5.00  4.50  3.94  4.01  5.00


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  177/1398  4.88  4.27  4.07  4.23  4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1391  5.00  4.52  4.30  4.48  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0  0  0  1  7  4.88  255/1388  4.88  4.56  4.28  4.50  4.88
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   3  0  0  1  0  4  4.60  179/ 958  4.60  4.13  3.93  4.24  4.60


             Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 9 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 240  ****  4.60  4.11  4.26  ****


             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  4.67  4.04  4.84  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  3.87  4.05  4.58  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  5.00  4.75  4.71  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  37  ****  5.00  4.58  4.73  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  4.50  4.56  4.64  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ART  447  0201              University of Maryland                        Page  160
Title       2D ANIMATION/COMPOSITI            Baltimore County                           FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  BELL, KATHRYN L                  Fall   2007                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     8
Questionnaires:  8                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  318/1639   4.75  4.45  4.27 4.42  4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  252/1639   4.75  4.38  4.22 4.29  4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   3  0  0  0  4  1  4.20  850/1397   4.20  4.50  4.28 4.38  4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  239/1583   4.75  4.50  4.19 4.31  4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  0  0  0  4  2  2  3.75 1046/1532   3.75  3.99  4.01 4.07  3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  6  0  0  1  0  1  4.00  824/1504   4.00  3.89  4.05 4.20  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  1  2  3  2  3.75 1279/1612   3.75  4.05  4.16 4.18  3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  7  1  4.13 1441/1635   4.13  4.63  4.65 4.72  4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  0  0  1  0  6  1  3.88 1079/1579   3.88  4.26  4.08 4.21  3.88


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2   0  0  0  2  1  3  4.17 1162/1518   4.17  4.47  4.43 4.51  4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  725/1520   4.83  4.87  4.70 4.75  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  2  0  0  0  1  2  3  4.33  800/1517   4.33  4.43  4.27 4.34  4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2   0  0  0  0  3  3  4.50  638/1550   4.50  4.24  4.22 4.24  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1295   5.00  4.50  3.94 4.01  5.00


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  4  0  1  1  0  0  2  3.25 1207/1398   3.25  4.27  4.07 4.23  3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  4  0  1  0  1  0  2  3.50 1220/1391   3.50  4.52  4.30 4.48  3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0  0  0  2  0  2  4.00  944/1388   4.00  4.56  4.28 4.50  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 4   3  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 958   ****  4.13  3.93 4.24  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ART  484  0101            University of Maryland                      Page  161
Title      ADVNCD 3D COMPUTER ANI          Baltimore County                         FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   MCDONALD, NEAL                  Fall   2007                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    25
Questionnaires:  17                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies         Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0  1  0  6  10  4.47  656/1639  4.47  4.45  4.27  4.42  4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0  1  2  9   5  4.06 1052/1639  4.06  4.38  4.22  4.29  4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   1  2  3  4   7  3.82 1138/1397  3.82  4.50  4.28  4.38  3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0  2  2  1  11  4.31  726/1583  4.31  4.50  4.19  4.31  4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  13  0  0  1  3   0  3.75 ****/1532  ****  3.99  4.01  4.07  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  1  3  1  6  4   2  3.06 1401/1504  3.06  3.89  4.05  4.20  3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0  4  0  6   7  3.94 1122/1612  3.94  4.05  4.16  4.18  3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0  0  0  1  16  4.94  397/1635  4.94  4.63  4.65  4.72  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0  1  3  6   3  3.85 1102/1579  3.85  4.26  4.08  4.21  3.85


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0  1  3  6   7  4.12 1196/1518  4.12  4.47  4.43  4.51  4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0  0  1  3  13  4.71  979/1520  4.71  4.87  4.70  4.75  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0  0  3  8   6  4.18  964/1517  4.18  4.43  4.27  4.34  4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0  1  3  5   8  4.18  963/1550  4.18  4.24  4.22  4.24  4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  0  0  2  3  12  4.59  229/1295  4.59  4.50  3.94  4.01  4.59


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  0  2  0  8   2  3.83  916/1398  3.83  4.27  4.07  4.23  3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  1  0  0  4   7  4.33  752/1391  4.33  4.52  4.30  4.48  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0  0  1  0  3   8  4.50  647/1388  4.50  4.56  4.28  4.50  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   4   0  1  1  2   4  4.13  424/ 958  4.13  4.13  3.93  4.24  4.13


                                    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      15
  28-55     0       1.00-1.99   0        B    6                                                  
  56-83     3       2.00-2.99   1        C    2      General              0    Under-grad  17      Non-major   2
  84-150    9       3.00-3.49   4        D    0
  Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   6        F    0      Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                               responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other               16
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ART  488  0101              University of Maryland                          Page  162
Title         ADV TOPICS: ANIM/IN ME         Baltimore County                             FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   BAILEY, DAN                     Fall   2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       9
Questionnaires:   7                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions             NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1639   5.00  4.45  4.27  4.42  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  163/1639   4.86  4.38  4.22  4.29  4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   5  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1397   5.00  4.50  4.28  4.38  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1583   5.00  4.50  4.19  4.31  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   6  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1532   ****  3.99  4.01  4.07  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  6  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1504   ****  3.89  4.05  4.20  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   1  0  0  1  0  5  4.67  317/1612   4.67  4.05  4.16  4.18  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1635   5.00  4.63  4.65  4.72  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  205/1579   4.71  4.26  4.08  4.21  4.71


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1518   5.00  4.47  4.43  4.51  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1520   5.00  4.87  4.70  4.75  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1517   5.00  4.43  4.27  4.34  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  253/1550   4.83  4.24  4.22  4.24  4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1295   5.00  4.50  3.94  4.01  5.00


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1398   5.00  4.27  4.07  4.23  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50  616/1391   4.50  4.52  4.30  4.48  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1388   5.00  4.56  4.28  4.50  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   1  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/ 958   5.00  4.13  3.93  4.24  5.00


                                     Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ART  489A 0101          University of Maryland                           Page 163
Title         TIME-BASED MEDIA          Baltimore County                            FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   DYER, ERIC G              Fall   2007                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    11
Questionnaires:  8                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  1  2  1  0  4  3.50 1497/1639  3.50  4.45  4.27 4.42  3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  2  2  4  4.25  859/1639  4.25  4.38  4.22 4.29  4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  2  1  0  0  5  3.63 1238/1397  3.63  4.50  4.28 4.38  3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  155/1583  4.88  4.50  4.19 4.31  4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  2  0  2  2  2  3.25 1360/1532  3.25  3.99  4.01 4.07  3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  291/1504  4.60  3.89  4.05 4.20  4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   1  0  0  1  2  4  4.43  603/1612  4.43  4.05  4.16 4.18  4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  5  3  4.38 1257/1635  4.38  4.63  4.65 4.72  4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  1  3  2  4.17  760/1579  4.17  4.26  4.08 4.21  4.17


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  529/1518  4.71  4.47  4.43 4.51  4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  674/1520  4.86  4.87  4.70 4.75  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  1  3  3  4.29  854/1517  4.29  4.43  4.27 4.34  4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  1  3  3  4.29  875/1550  4.29  4.24  4.22 4.24  4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  265/1295  4.50  4.50  3.94 4.01  4.50


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  1  0  2  4  4.29  599/1398  4.29  4.27  4.07 4.23  4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  279/1391  4.86  4.52  4.30 4.48  4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  276/1388  4.86  4.56  4.28 4.50  4.86
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   2  0  0  2  0  3  4.20  380/ 958  4.20  4.13  3.93 4.24  4.20


                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ART  494  0103              University of Maryland                        Page  164
Title          INTERNSHIP                    Baltimore County                          FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    COOK, CATHY                   Fall   2007                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    1
Questionnaires: 1                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                    General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/1639  5.00  4.45  4.27  4.42  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/1639  5.00  4.38  4.22  4.29  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/1583  5.00  4.50  4.19  4.31  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1044/1612 4.00  4.05  4.16  4.18  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/1635  5.00  4.63  4.65  4.72  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00  1/1579  5.00  4.26  4.08  4.21  5.00


                  Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/ 50  5.00  4.79  4.45  4.85  5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/ 32  5.00  5.00  4.51  4.00  5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/ 43  5.00  5.00  4.69  4.85  5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/ 32  5.00  3.67  4.37  4.67  5.00


                               Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ART  495  0125                University of Maryland                                 Page  165
Title       INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH                 Baltimore County                                  FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  PEREGOY, CHRIST                          Fall   2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    1
Questionnaires:  1                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                   General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1639   5.00  4.45  4.27  4.42  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1090/1639   4.67  4.38  4.22  4.29  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1583   5.00  4.50  4.19  4.31  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00  774/1532   4.50  3.99  4.01  4.07  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1519/1612   4.33  4.05  4.16  4.18  3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1497/1635   4.67  4.63  4.65  4.72  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  889/1579   4.67  4.26  4.08  4.21  4.00

                   Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1237/1518   4.00  4.47  4.43  4.51  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1520   5.00  4.87  4.70  4.75  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1083/1517   4.00  4.43  4.27  4.34  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1550   5.00  4.24  4.22  4.24  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  623/1295   4.00  4.50  3.94  4.01  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     0     Major       1
  28-55     0      1.00-1.99    0        B    0
  56-83     0      2.00-2.99    0        C    0         General              0    Under-grad   1     Non-major   0
  84-150    0      3.00-3.49    0        D    0
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    0        F    0         Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0         Other                1
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ART  495  0129                    University of Maryland                           Page  166
Title         INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH                 Baltimore County                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   CHAN, IRENE Y.                          Fall   2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    1
Questionnaires:  1                           Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                               Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                   General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1639  5.00  4.45  4.27  4.42  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1639  4.67  4.38  4.22  4.29  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1397  5.00  4.50  4.28  4.38  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1583  5.00  4.50  4.19  4.31  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1612  4.33  4.05  4.16  4.18  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1635  4.67  4.63  4.65  4.72  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1579  4.67  4.26  4.08  4.21  5.00


                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades            Reasons              Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0         0.00-0.99    0         A    1         Required for Majors   0     Graduate      0      Major        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    1      Non-major    0
  84-150    1         3.00-3.49    0         D    0
  Grad.     0         3.50-4.00    0         F    0         Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    0                                      responses to be significant
                                            I    0         Other                 0
                                            ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ART  495  0146            University of Maryland                          Page  167
Title       INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH          Baltimore County                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  WORDEN, FRED                      Fall   2007                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    1
Questionnaires:  1                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

			Frequencies					Instructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	4.67	4.38	4.22	4.29	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.50	4.19	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	4.50	3.99	4.01	4.07	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	3.89	4.05	4.20	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	4.33	4.05	4.16	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	4.67	4.63	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	4.67	4.26	4.08	4.21	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.27	4.07	4.23	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.52	4.30	4.48	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.56	4.28	4.50	5.00

```
                                          Frequency Distribution
```

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

```
Course-Section: ART  610  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  168
Title        IMAG. DIGITAL SEMINAR           Baltimore County                              FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  BRADLEY, STEPHE                 Fall  2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     7
Questionnaires: 7                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean Mean Mean Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  1  1  3  2 3.86 1289/1639  3.86  4.45 4.27 4.42 3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  2  3  2 4.00 1090/1639  4.00  4.38 4.22 4.26 4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   5  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1397  5.00  4.50 4.28 4.37 5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   2  0  0  3  1  1 3.60 1367/1583  3.60  4.50 4.19 4.31 3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2  1  0  3  0  1 3.00 1421/1532  3.00  3.99 4.01 4.10 3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4  0  0  2  0  1 3.67 1116/1504  3.67  3.89 4.05 4.29 3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   2  0  0  3  1  1 3.60 1360/1612  3.60  4.05 4.16 4.27 3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  1  6 4.86  736/1635  4.86  4.63 4.65 4.81 4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0  3  1  0 3.25 1420/1579  3.25  4.26 4.08 4.17 3.25

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  2  3  2 4.00 1237/1518  4.00  4.47 4.43 4.49 4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  0  0  7 5.00    1/1520  5.00  4.87 4.70 4.79 5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0  1  3  2  1 3.43 1376/1517  3.43  4.43 4.27 4.32 3.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  1  4  0  2 3.43 1360/1550  3.43  4.24 4.22 4.23 3.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1  0  1  2  1  2 3.67  894/1295  3.67  4.50 3.94 3.95 3.67

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  1  2  1  2 3.67 1030/1398  3.67  4.27 4.07 4.22 3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0  0  1  0  1  4 4.33  752/1391  4.33  4.52 4.30 4.47 4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0  0  0  2  4 4.67  496/1388  4.67  4.56 4.28 4.49 4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                 1   3  0  0  0  1  2 4.67  155/ 958  4.67  4.13 3.93 4.01 4.67

                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5 0  0  0  1  0  1 4.00   69/  85  4.00  4.75 4.58 4.58 4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 5 0 0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/  82  5.00  5.00 4.52 4.74 5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 5 0  0  0  0  1  1 4.50   45/  78  4.50  4.83 4.47 4.52 4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   5   0  0  0  1  0  1 4.00   58/  80  4.00  4.75 4.47 4.50 4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               5   0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/  82  5.00  4.63 4.16 4.37 5.00

                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 6 0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  52  ****  4.67 4.04 3.64 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 6 0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  53  ****  3.87 4.05 4.03 ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      6   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  42  ****  5.00 4.75 4.78 ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  6   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  37  ****  5.00 4.58 4.33 ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6 0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  32  ****  4.50 4.56 4.59 ****

                            Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades       Reasons              Type              Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1       0.00-0.99    3      A    6     Required for Majors  0    Graduate      5    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    2    Non-major    7
  84-150    0       3.00-3.49    0      D    0
  Grad.     5       3.50-4.00    0      F    0     Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                               responses to be significant
                                       I    0     Other                7
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ART  620   0101              University of Maryland                                     Page 169
Title        HIST I&D ARTS                      Baltimore County                                      FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  MAHONEY, JAMES                      Fall   2007                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      7
Questionnaires:  6                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                           Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean   Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  231/1639  4.83  4.45  4.27 4.42  4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  177/1639  4.83  4.38  4.22 4.26  4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   3  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1397  5.00  4.50  4.28 4.37  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1583  5.00  4.50  4.19 4.31  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  335/1532  4.50  3.99  4.01 4.10  4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  0  1  5  4.83  138/1504  4.83  3.89  4.05 4.29  4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1612  5.00  4.05  4.16 4.27  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1635  5.00  4.63  4.65 4.81  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0  1  4  4.80  137/1579  4.80  4.26  4.08 4.17  4.80

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  315/1518  4.83  4.47  4.43 4.49  4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1520  5.00  4.87  4.70 4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  214/1517  4.83  4.43  4.27 4.32  4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  253/1550  4.83  4.24  4.22 4.23  4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0  1  0  2  3  4.17  529/1295  4.17  4.50  3.94 3.95  4.17

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  200/1398  4.83  4.27  4.07 4.22  4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1391  5.00  4.52  4.30 4.47  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1388  5.00  4.56  4.28 4.49  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   2  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  119/ 958  4.75  4.13  3.93 4.01  4.75

             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  4.75  4.58 4.58  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 5 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  5.00  4.52 4.74  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 5  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  78  ****  4.83  4.47 4.52  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    5   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  4.75  4.47 4.50  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                5   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  4.63  4.16 4.37  ****

                            Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ART  638  0129              University of Maryland                           Page  170
Title       TEACH PRACTICUM                   Baltimore County                            FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  PEREGOY, CHRIST                     Fall   2007                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     1
Questionnaires:  1                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1639  5.00  4.45  4.27  4.42  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1639  5.00  4.38  4.22  4.26  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1532  5.00  3.99  4.01  4.10  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1504  5.00  3.89  4.05  4.29  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1635  5.00  4.63  4.65  4.81  5.00

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1518  5.00  4.47  4.43  4.49  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1520  5.00  4.87  4.70  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1517  5.00  4.43  4.27  4.32  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1550  5.00  4.24  4.22  4.23  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1295  5.00  4.50  3.94  3.95  5.00

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1398  5.00  4.27  4.07  4.22  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1391  5.00  4.52  4.30  4.47  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1388  5.00  4.56  4.28  4.49  5.00


                                       Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ART  640  0101              University of Maryland                              Page  171
Title       IMAGING & DIGITAL STUD          Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN  (Instr. A)      Fall   2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     7
Questionnaires:  4                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                      Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions          NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  3  1 4.25  890/1639  4.25 4.45  4.27 4.42  4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  0  1  2 4.00 1090/1639  4.00 4.38  4.22 4.26  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   3  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/1397  5.00 4.50  4.28 4.37  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  2  2 4.50  476/1583  4.50 4.50  4.19 4.31  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  1  0  2 3.75 1046/1532  3.75 3.99  4.01 4.10  3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1  1  0  2 3.75 1051/1504  3.75 3.89  4.05 4.29  3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  1  1  2 4.25  814/1612  4.25 4.05  4.16 4.27  4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  4  0 4.00 1497/1635  4.00 4.63  4.65 4.81  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0  0  3  1 4.25  657/1579  4.25 4.26  4.08 4.17  4.25

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  1  2  1 4.00 1237/1518  4.00 4.47  4.43 4.49  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1520  5.00 4.87  4.70 4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  2  2 4.50  597/1517  4.50 4.43  4.27 4.32  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  2  1  1 3.75 1237/1550  3.88 4.24  4.22 4.23  3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0  0  0  2  2 4.50  265/1295  4.50 4.50  3.94 3.95  4.50

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  3  1 4.25  625/1398  4.25 4.27  4.07 4.22  4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0  0  0  0  1  3 4.75  393/1391  4.75 4.52  4.30 4.47  4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0  0  0  2  2 4.50  647/1388  4.50 4.56  4.28 4.49  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   1  0  0  1  0  2 4.33  307/ 958  4.33 4.13  3.93 4.01  4.33

                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  3   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/ 224  5.00 4.96  4.10 4.43  5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3 0 1  0  0  0  0 1.00  218/ 219  1.00 2.29  4.44 4.23  1.00

                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/  85  5.00 4.75  4.58 4.58  5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3 0 0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/  82  5.00 5.00  4.52 4.74  5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/  78  5.00 4.83  4.47 4.52  5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    3   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/  80  5.00 4.75  4.47 4.50  5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                3   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/  82  5.00 4.63  4.16 4.37  5.00

                 Self  Paced
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       3   0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00   27/  32  3.00 3.67  4.37 4.31  3.00

                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ART 640 0101                University of Maryland                           Page 172
Title      IMAGING & DIGITAL STUD            Baltimore County                                FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:                (Instr. B)             Fall  2007                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    7
Questionnaires:  4                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  0  3  1  4.25  890/1639  4.25  4.45  4.27 4.42  4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  1  0  1  2  4.00 1090/1639  4.00  4.38  4.22 4.26  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   3  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1397  5.00  4.50  4.28 4.37  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50  476/1583  4.50  4.50  4.19 4.31  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  1  1  0  2  3.75 1046/1532  3.75  3.99  4.01 4.10  3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1  0  2  3.75 1051/1504  3.75  3.89  4.05 4.29  3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  814/1612  4.25  4.05  4.16 4.27  4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  4  0  4.00 1497/1635  4.00  4.63  4.65 4.81  4.00

              Lecture
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    3   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1077/1550  3.88  4.24  4.22 4.23  3.88


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  3  1  4.25  625/1398  4.25  4.27  4.07 4.22  4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0  0  0  1  3  4.75  393/1391  4.75  4.52  4.30 4.47  4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0  2  2  4.50  647/1388  4.50  4.56  4.28 4.49  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                 0   1  0  0  1  0  2  4.33  307/ 958  4.33  4.13  3.93 4.01  4.33

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 224  5.00  4.96  4.10 4.43  5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3 0 1  0  0  0  0  1.00  218/ 219  1.00  2.29  4.44 4.23  1.00

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  85  5.00  4.75  4.58 4.58  5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  82  5.00  5.00  4.52 4.74  5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 3 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  78  5.00  4.83  4.47 4.52  5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  80  5.00  4.75  4.47 4.50  5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  82  5.00  4.63  4.16 4.37  5.00

              Self  Paced
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      3   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00   27/  32  3.00  3.67  4.37 4.31  3.00

                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ART  720A 0101              University of Maryland                              Page  173
Title        WRTNG BY & ABOUT ARTIS         Baltimore County                                  FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  MAHONEY, JAMES                 Fall   2007                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     5
Questionnaires:  5                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                       Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank     Mean   Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
          General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00    1/1639   5.00   4.45  4.27  4.42  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00    1/1639   5.00   4.38  4.22  4.26  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00    1/1397   5.00   4.50  4.28  4.37  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00    1/1583   5.00   4.50  4.19  4.31  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00    1/1532   5.00   3.99  4.01  4.10  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0   0   0   0   4  5.00    1/1504   5.00   3.89  4.05  4.29  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00    1/1612   5.00   4.05  4.16  4.27  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00    1/1635   5.00   4.63  4.65  4.81  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0   0   0   0   2  5.00    1/1579   5.00   4.26  4.08  4.17  5.00


          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00    1/1518   5.00   4.47  4.43  4.49  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00    1/1520   5.00   4.87  4.70  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00    1/1517   5.00   4.43  4.27  4.32  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00    1/1550   5.00   4.24  4.22  4.23  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0  0   0   0   1   3  4.75  135/1295   4.75   4.50  3.94  3.95  4.75


          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1398   5.00   4.27  4.07  4.22  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1391   5.00   4.52  4.30  4.47  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1388   5.00   4.56  4.28  4.49  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/ 958   5.00   4.13  3.93  4.01  5.00


          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  4   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 224  ****   4.96  4.10  4.43  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 4 0 0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 240  ****   4.60  4.11  3.96  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 219  ****   2.29  4.44  4.23  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           4   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 215  ****   ****  4.35  4.72  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 4   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 198  ****   ****  4.18  4.74  ****


          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 4  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  85  ****   4.75  4.58  4.58  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 4 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  82  ****   5.00  4.52  4.74  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  78  ****   4.83  4.47  4.52  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    4   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  80  ****   4.75  4.47  4.50  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                4   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  82  ****   4.63  4.16  4.37  ****


          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 4   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  52  ****   4.67  4.04  3.64  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 4   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  53  ****   3.87  4.05  4.03  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       4   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  42  ****   5.00  4.75  4.78  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   4   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  37  ****   5.00  4.58  4.33  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 4   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  32  ****   4.50  4.56  4.59  ****


          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  50  ****   4.79  4.45  4.39  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    4   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  32  ****   5.00  4.51  4.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      4   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  43  ****   5.00  4.69  4.61  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       4   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  32  ****   3.67  4.37  4.31  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     4   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  21  ****   ****  4.52  4.42  ****
```

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	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	5	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: ART  740  0101                    University of Maryland                                Page  174
Title          ADV. I&D STUDIO                      Baltimore County                                    FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    STURGEON, JOHN                        Fall   2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       6
Questionnaires:   6                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1  0  1  1  2  0  1 2.80 1622/1639 2.80  4.45  4.27 4.42  2.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  1  0  1  1  2 3.60 1444/1639 3.60  4.38  4.22 4.26  3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  4  0  1  0  0  0 2.00 ****/1397 ****  4.50  4.28 4.37  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2  1  1  0  1  0  1 3.00 1532/1583 3.00  4.50  4.19 4.31  3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  1  0  1  3 4.20  633/1532 4.20  3.99  4.01 4.10  4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 1  0  1  2  1 3.40 1259/1504 3.40  3.89  4.05 4.29  3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  1  0  1  1  1  1 3.50 1399/1612 3.50  4.05  4.16 4.27  3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0  4  1 4.20 1396/1635 4.20  4.63  4.65 4.81  4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1  1  0  1  0 2.33 1565/1579 2.33  4.26  4.08 4.17  2.33


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  1  0  0  0  4 4.20 1141/1518 4.20  4.47  4.43 4.49  4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  1  0  4 4.60 1115/1520 4.60  4.87  4.70 4.79  4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  1  0  0  1  3 4.00 1083/1517 4.00  4.43  4.27 4.32  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  1  0  1  3 4.20  944/1550 4.20  4.24  4.22 4.23  4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0  0  0  1  0  4 4.60  221/1295 4.60  4.50  3.94 3.95  4.60


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0  1  0  0  1  3 4.00  770/1398 4.00  4.27  4.07 4.22  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 1  0  1  1  2 3.60 1192/1391 3.60  4.52  4.30 4.47  3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 1  0  0  2  3 4.00  944/1388 4.00  4.56  4.28 4.49  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  1  4  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 958 ****  4.13  3.93 4.01  ****


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  4  1  1  0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/ 224 ****  4.96  4.10 4.43  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0 0 0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/ 240 ****  4.60  4.11 3.96  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 5 0 0 0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/ 219 ****  2.29  4.44 4.23  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 4 0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/  85 5.00  4.75  4.58 4.58  5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 4 0 0 0  0  0  2 5.00    1/  82 5.00  5.00  4.52 4.74  5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4 1  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  78 ****  4.83  4.47 4.52  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    4  0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/  80 5.00  4.75  4.47 4.50  5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                4  0  0  0  1  1  0 3.50   64/  82 3.50  4.63  4.16 4.37  3.50

                                          Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: ART  790  0126                 University of Maryland                              Page  175
Title         IND. STUDIES                      Baltimore County                                  FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   WORDEN, FRED                        Fall   2007                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     1
Questionnaires:  1                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1639  5.00  4.45  4.27  4.42  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1639  5.00  4.38  4.22  4.26  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1583  5.00  4.50  4.19  4.31  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1612  5.00  4.05  4.16  4.27  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1635  5.00  4.63  4.65  4.81  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1579  5.00  4.26  4.08  4.17  5.00

                  Lecture
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1295  5.00  4.50  3.94  3.95  5.00


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/  50  5.00  4.79  4.45  4.39  5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/  32  5.00  5.00  4.51  4.50  5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/  43  5.00  5.00  4.69  4.61  5.00

                                  Frequency Distribution

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