Course-Section: ART 210 0201

Title VISUAL CONCEPTS

Instructor: NOHE, TIM

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 105 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	mier	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
*														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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		4.34	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	2		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		****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 78	****	4.83	4.47	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	4.75	4.47	2.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	4.63	4.16	4.00	****
-1.22														
Field Work	0	•	0	•	0	_	_	F 00		also also also also	4 60	4 0 4	4 50	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 52	****	4.67	4.04	4.78	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 53	4.67	3.87	4.05	4.28	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75		****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 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

Title VISUAL CONCEPTS

Instructor: NOHE, TIM
Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 10

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 105 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 210 0301

Title VISUAL CONCEPTS

Instructor: CHAN, IRENE Y.

Enrollment: 12
Questionnaires: 9

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 106 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questions		NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	_			Sect Mean
Quescions									Ralik	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		1190/1612		4.05	4.16	4.21	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	1		1447/1635		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		4.87	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		4.24	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		4.27	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		4.52	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		4.56	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		,	****	4.75	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	,		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		****/ 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		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	****

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

12

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 106 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	L
				P	0			responses to 1	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2007

Page 107 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: ART 210 0401

32

VISUAL CONCEPTS

BELL, KATHRYN L

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 27

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect.
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	17	4.52	604/1639	4.50	4.45	4.27	/ 2E	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	15	4.33	774/1639	4.42	4.45	4.27	4.35 4.27	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	17	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	517/1397	4.42	4.50	4.22	4.39	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2		14	4.38	625/1583	4.69	4.50	4.19	4.28	4.38
<u>.</u> 3	1	18	0	1	1	2	14	4.38		3.83	3.99	4.19	4.28	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	18	3	3	7	<i>3</i> 5	3		774/1532					
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	_	0	3 0	/ 6	5	1 2		1303/1504	3.13	3.89 4.05	4.05	4.09	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	6 1	25	13	4.27	802/1612 1525/1635	4.22	4.05	4.16	4.21	4.27 3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	-	0	0	3		0			4.45			4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	U	U	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	Ω	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	Ω	15	4.36	805/1550	4.41	4.24	4.22	4.33	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	Δ	0	1	2	20	4.83	103/1295	4.81	4.50	3.94	4.07	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	Τ.	U	U	1	2	20	4.03	103/1295	4.01	4.50	3.94	4.07	4.03
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	****	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utior	า									
	equency Distribution													
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	•	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 1	 L1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	в 1	L1						
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 enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	19	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 211 0101

Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM

Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA

Enrollment: 34
Questionnaires: 29

THOMPSON, CALLA Fall 2007 34

Page 108 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

J 1		
29	Student Course Evaluation Questionn	aire

Questions		NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	§ 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect 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		4.74	311/1517		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	_	_			-			4 ==	060/205	4	4 0=	4 0=		4 55
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	260/1398		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		4.92	201/1388	4.72	4.56	4.28		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		****/ 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		****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	0	0	0	-/		****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	2	0	0	0	0	6		****/ 78	****	4.83	4.47	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21 21	1 1	0	0	0	0	7 7		****/ 80 ****/ 82	****	4.75 4.63	4.47 4.16	2.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	U	U	U	U	/	5.00	****/ 82		4.03	4.10	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		3.87	4.05	4.28	4.44
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	2	0	0	0	1	6		****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	0	0	7		****/ 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		****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.33	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	2	0	0	0	1	5		****/ 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	****

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Course-Section: ART 211 0101

Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM

Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA

Enrollment: 34
Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 108 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	 А	18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	С	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 enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				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 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SILBERG, STEVEN

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	nı gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	508/1639	4.70	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.60
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	684/1639		4.38	4.22	4.27	4.40
		uestions reflec		-	0	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	175/1397		4.50	4.28	4.39	4.89
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	299/1583		4.50	4.19	4.28	4.70
				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 wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	2	2	3.30	1323/1504	3.74	3.89	4.05	4.09	3.30
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	976/1612	4.44	4.05	4.16	4.21	4.10
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	855/1635	4.54	4.63	4.65	4.63	4.78
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	527/1579	4.46	4.26	4.08	4.14	4.38
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	416/1518	4.84	4.47	4.43	4.48	4.78
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	546/1520		4.87	4.70	4.78	4.90
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearl					0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	275/1517	4.78	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.78
4. Did th	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	580/1550	4.53	4.24	4.22	4.33	4.56
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	577/1295	4.50	4.50	3.94	4.07	4.10
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d 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 th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d 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 s	pecial t	echniques succe	ssful	_	1	5	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	806/ 958	4.09	4.13	3.93	4.00	3.25
				Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	utior	ı									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	ne			Majors	<b>.</b>
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	5	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2								_	_	_	_			_
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 2		Gei	nera:	L				1	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0								_						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0									respons	es to k	e sign	ıficar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner					8						

? 0

Course-Section: ART 211 0401

Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM

Instructor: SAAH, CHRIS

Enrollment: 12
Questionnaires: 8

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 110 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eanei	ncies			Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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		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		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		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		4.88
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
1														
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		****/ 78	****	4.83	4.47	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	4.75	4.47	2.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 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		****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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

Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM

Instructor: SAAH, CHRIS

Enrollment: 12
Questionnaires: 8

L CONCEPTS II/CAM Baltimore County
CHRIS Fall 2007

Page 110 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General		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	ι
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 211 0501 University of Maryland Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM Baltimore County

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: SILBERG, STEVEN

Enrollment: 15 Ouestionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 111

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 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 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 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 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 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 5 0 227/1391 4.68 4.52 4.30 4.35 4.90 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 1 9 4.90 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 00 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 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 240 4.88 4.60 4.11 4.47 \*\*\*\* Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General		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 enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				2	1						

Course-Section: ART 212 0101 University of Maryland Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: BRADLEY, STEPHE

Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 112

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new 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
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utio	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected	d 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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	13	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 212 0201

VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D

Title Instructor: SHIFLET, NICOLE

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 10

2

2

0

56-83

84-150

Grad.

0

0

4

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

C 1

D

F

Ρ

0

0

0

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 113 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Non-major

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions	S	NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 54	ou anin n	General		0	0	1	0	1	2	6	4 20	951/1639	3.86	1 1E	4 27	/ 2E	4.20
_	_		lls from this course the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	5		1014/1639	3.86	4.45	4.27	4.35 4.27	4.20
			t the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	1		****/1397		4.50	4.28	4.39	****
	_		the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30			4.50	4.19	4.28	4.30
			ute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	1	0		****/1532		3.99	4.01	4.09	****
	_	g system clearly	_	0	1	0	2	3	2	2		1424/1612		4.05	4.16	4.21	3.44
		was class cance		0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1635		4.63	4.65	4.63	5.00
	-		ll teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00			4.26	4.08	4.14	
		Lecture	e														
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lectures	s 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 th	ne instru	ctor seem intere	ested 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 $1\epsilon$	ecture mat	terial presented	d 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 th	ne lectur	es contribute to	o 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 au	udiovisua	l techniques enl	nance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	221/1295	4.11	4.50	3.94	4.07	4.60
		Discus							_								
			ute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	426/1398		4.27	4.07	4.14	4.50
		_	couraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1391		4.52	4.30		5.00
		_	fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1388		4.56	4.28		5.00
4. Were s	special to	echniques succes	SSIUI	2	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	456/ 958	3.54	4.13	3.93	4.00	4.00
2 Were s	zou provi	Laborat	tory te background information	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 240	****	4.60	4.11	4.47	****
_	-	_	lable for lab activities	8	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 219	****	2.29	4.44	4.61	****
	_	structor provide		8	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 215		****	4.35	4.43	****
		Semina	r														
1. Were a	assigned t	topics relevant	to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.00	****
2. Was th	ne instru	ctor available i	for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	3.00	****
_			to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80		4.75	4.47	2.00	****
5. Were o	criteria :	for grading made	e clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.16	4.00	****
1 5 1 5		Field V		6	0	0			-	0	4 00	***** / = 0	de de de s	4 65	4 0 4	4 86	****
			te to what you learned	9 9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 52 ****/ 53		4.67	4.04	4.78	****
			ur evaluation criteria	9	0 0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53 ****/ 37		3.87	4.05 4.58	4.28	****
4. 10 WII	at degree	could you also	uss your evaluations	9	U	U	U	U	Τ	U	4.00	****/ 3/	****	5.00	4.58		
		Self I															
	_	-	ute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 50		4.79	4.45	3.24	****
			r the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32		5.00	4.51	4.33	****
3. Were y	your conta	acts with the in	nstructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	****	****
			Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0 A 6		Re	 quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	 s	0	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	 or	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0 B 3									3					

General

Electives

0

0

Under-grad 10

### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

I 0 Other 10 ?

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

Page 114

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SHEFFIELD, SAM Fall 2007

Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 15 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	814/1639	3.86	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.33
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33		3.78	4.38	4.22	4.27	4.33
		estions reflec			0	14	0	0	0	0	1		****/1397	****	4.50	4.28	4.39	****
	_	ations reflect		_	0	0	1	1	0	5	8	4.20			4.50	4.19	4.28	4.20
				what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	8	3		1012/1532		3.99	4.01	4.09	3.79
	_	_		o what you learned	0	3	1	1	5	3	2		1303/1504		3.89	4.05	4.09	3.33
		system clearl			0	0	1	1	7	4	2		1455/1612		4.05	4.16	4.21	3.33
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	5	10		1001/1635		4.63	4.65		4.67
	-			hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	9	4		601/1579			4.08	4.14	4.31
				-														
		Lectur																
		ctor's lecture			2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	170/1518		4.47	4.43	4.48	4.92
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear						0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1520	4.78	4.87	4.70	4.78	5.00
							0	0	0	5	8	4.62	462/1517	4.09	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.62
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	1	4	8	4.54	603/1550	3.96	4.24	4.22	4.33	4.54
5. Did aud	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand						1	0	0	0	12	4.69	167/1295	4.11	4.50	3.94	4.07	4.69
		Discus	aion															
الماما ال				what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	660/1398	3.86	4.27	4.07	4.14	4.21
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	7	11		356/1391		4.52	4.30	4.14	4.21
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	11		435/1388	4.42	4.56	4.28	4.37	4.71
		echniques succe		d Open discussion	1	5	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	307/ 958			3.93	4.00	4.33
T. WELE S	peciai ce	scinifques succe	ssiui		1	J	U	U	_	-	-	1.55	3077 930	3.31	1.13	3.93	4.00	1.33
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ty	ne			Majors	
										, 								, 
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 11						quire	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	14
28-55																		
56-83						Gei	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	1
84-150	-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0																	
Grad.								<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1				_	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her				1	.4						
			? 0															

#### Course-Section: ART 212 0401 University of Maryland Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: YOUNG, SHANNON

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 115

			Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	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
<u> </u>														
Lecture	_		_	_		_	_							
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	Τ	Τ	Ţ	Τ	2		1449/1518		4.47		4.48	3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	4		1188/1520		4.87	4.70	4.78	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	2	1	1	2		1347/1517		4.43	4.27	4.34	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	2	1	1		1419/1550		4.24		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		1247/1391		4.52	4.30	4.35	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	0	3		1078/1388		4.56	4.28	4.37	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	2	0	0	0	1		931/ 958		4.13	3.93	4.00	2.33
4. Were special techniques successful	O	2	2	U	U	U	1	4.33	JJ1/ JJ0	3.34	4.13	3.93	4.00	4.33
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ıt i oı	า									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	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 sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				2	1						

Course-Section: ART 213 0101

Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D

Instructor: MOREN, LISA

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 28

Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 116 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Frequencies		Instructor	Course Dept	UMBC Level	Sect
Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4		Mean Rank	Mean Mean		Mean
General					
	12 4	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		4.12 992/1639		4.22 4.27	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3 22 0 0 3		4.00 ****/1397		4.28 4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 3 1 0 1 0 14		4.29 751/1583		4.19 4.28	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4 9 2 1 3 6		3.47 1264/1532		4.01 4.09	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 16 1 1 3 1		3.25 1340/1504		4.05 4.09	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 4 0 2 2 7 8		3.50 1399/1612		4.16 4.21	3.50
		4.88 706/1635			4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 4 15	5 4	4.04 865/1579		4.08 4.14	4.04
Lecture					
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 5 0 1 0 1 11 1	10 4	4.26 1085/1518	4.50 4.47	4.43 4.48	4.26
	21 4	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 5 12	6 4	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	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	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	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	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	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	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 2	0 4	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	5.00 ****/ 219	**** 2.29	4.44 4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 26 1 0 0 0	1 5	5.00 ****/ 215	**** ***	4.35 4.43	****
Seminar					
5. Were criteria for grading made clear 27 0 0 0 1	0 4	4.00 ****/ 82	**** 4.63	4.16 4.00	****
Field Work					
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned $$ 25 $$ 0 $$ 0 $$ 0 $$ 2	1 4	4.33 ****/ 52		4.04 4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria $$ 25 $$ 0 $$ 0 $$ 1 $$ 2	0 3	3.67 ****/ 53		4.05 4.28	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation $000000000000000000000000000000000000$	1 5	5.00 ****/ 42		4.75 ****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations $$ 25 $$ 1 $$ 0 $$ 2	0 4	4.00 ****/ 37		4.58 ****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 25 1 0 0 1 1	0 3	3.50 ****/ 32	! **** 4.50	4.56 ****	****
Self Paced					
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 27 0 0 1 0 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 27 0 0 0 1 0	0 3	3.00 ****/ 50 3.00 ****/ 43		4.45 3.24 4.69 ****	****
		,			
Enominar Dightiling					
Frequency Distribution					
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons			pe 	Majors 	
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons           00-27         0         0.00-0.99         0         A         16         Required for Majors					
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons           00-27         0         0.00-0.99         0         A 16         Required for Majors           28-55         6         1.00-1.99         0         B 6	0	Graduat	e 0	Major	16
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons           00-27         0         0.00-0.99         0         A 16         Required for Majors           28-55         6         1.00-1.99         0         B 6           56-83         4         2.00-2.99         0         C 1         General		Graduat		Major	16
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons           00-27         0         0.00-0.99         0         A 16         Required for Majors           28-55         6         1.00-1.99         0         B 6           56-83         4         2.00-2.99         0         C 1         General           84-150         3         3.00-3.49         0         D         0	0	Graduat Under-g	e 0	Major Non-major	16 12
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons           00-27         0         0.00-0.99         0         A 16         Required for Majors           28-55         6         1.00-1.99         0         B 6           56-83         4         2.00-2.99         0         C 1         General	0	Graduat Under-g #### -	e 0	Major  Non-major  are not enoug	16 12

? 0

Course-Section: ART 213 0301 University of Maryland Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D

NOHE, TIM

Instructor:

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 117

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 27 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 5 1		Genera		. 1 . 1	0	0	•	•	2	_	1.0	4 56	F.C.1 /1.C.2.0	4 50	4 45	4 00	4 25	4 5 6
		w insights,ski			0	0	0	0	3	6	18	4.56	561/1639		4.45	4.27	4.35	4.56
		tor make clear estions reflec			0	0 24	0	1	0	0	18 2	4.48	550/1639		4.38	4.22	4.27	4.48
		ations reflect			1	24 1	0	0	4	8			****/1397		4.50		4.39	
				what you learned	0	7	2	0	5	5	14 8	4.38	625/1583		4.50 3.99	4.19 4.01	4.28 4.09	4.38
				what you learned o what you learned			1	1	2	0	1		950/1532 ****/1504		3.89	4.01		3.85
		system clearl			1	21 1	2	U T	9	9	6		1332/1612		4.05	4.16	4.09 4.21	3.65
		was class cand		Inea	0	1	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	691/1635		4.63	4.16	4.63	4.88
				hing effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	3 7		4.59	292/1579			4.08		4.59
9. HOW WOL	iia you g	rade the overa	.ii tead	ning effectiveness	5	U	U	U	Т	,	14	4.59	292/15/9	4.32	4.20	4.00	4.14	4.59
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	472/1518	4.50	4.47	4.43	4.48	4.74
					0	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	219/1520	4.94	4.87	4.70	4.78	4.96
3. Was led	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject was lecture material presented and explained clear of the lectures contribute to what you learned and audiovisual techniques enhance your understand.					0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	486/1517	4.32	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.59
4. Did the	oid the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	457/1550	4.27	4.24	4.22	4.33	4.67
5. Did aud	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand:						0	0	1	2	22	4.84	98/1295	4.59	4.50	3.94	4.07	4.84
		_																
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute 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
				d to participate	5	0	1	0	1	2	18	4.64	516/1391	4.44	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.64
				d 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 sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		5	11	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	290/ 958	4.12	4.13	3.93	4.00	4.36
		- 1																
1 Did the	. 1 - 1	Labora		£ +10	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	++++/ 224	++++	1 00	1 10	4.33	++++
			_	f the material ground information	26 26	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 224 ****/ 240	****	4.96	4.10 4.11	4.33	****
2. Were yo	ou brovio	ed with adequa	.ce Dack	ground information	20	U	U	U	Т	U	U	3.00	/ 240		4.00	4.11	4.4/	
		Field	Work															
1. Did fie	eld exper			hat you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.04	4.78	***
				uation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.87	4.05	4.28	****
		tor available			26	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 42		5.00	4.75	****	***
				Frequ	lency	Dist	tribu	ution	1									
G		G GD3		Towns wheel Goods				D -									No	
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	; 			Ту	pe 			Majors	; 
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 1 A 14						auire	ed fo	or Ma	ior	s	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	22
28-55										. ,				-	-			
56-83						Gei	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 2	27	Non-	major	5
84-150													3				-	
Grad.							ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enou	<sub>j</sub> h
				P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Otl	ner				2	1	-					
				? 0														

Course-Section: ART 214 0101 University of Maryland DRAWING I Baltimore County

Questionnaires: 16

Page 118 Title FEB 13, 2008 GARDNER, SYMMES Instructor: Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 16

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	ution	n									
Oxedita Farned Orm ODA Ermosted Oxedes				Da	222	_			т.				Majawa	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	 Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				2	0						

Course-Section: ART 215 0101

Title INTRO TO ART & MEDIA

Instructor: DURANT, MARK

Enrollment: 138
Questionnaires: 92

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 119 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

				Fr	eque	encie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1. Did you gain ne	ew 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
	ctor 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
	uestions reflect the expected goals	1	69	0	3	3	3	13	4.18	****/1397	****	4.50	4.28	4.39	***
4. Did other evalu	uations 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
	eadings 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 ass	signments 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	g 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	4.8
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	4.0
	Lecture														
1. Were the instru	uctor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	5	16	68	4.65	629/1518	4.65	4.47	4.43	4.48	4.6
	ctor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	6	8	77	4.75	890/1520	4.75	4.87	4.70	4.78	4.7
3. Was lecture mat	terial presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	7	15	66	4.57	510/1517	4.57	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.5
4. Did the lecture	es contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	2	11	13	61	4.41	755/1550	4.41	4.24	4.22	4.33	4.4
5. Did audiovisual	l techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	2	1	5	9	69	4.65	191/1295	4.65	4.50	3.94	4.07	4.6
	Discussion														
1. Did class discu	ussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	7	4	16	16	35	3.87	899/1398	3.87	4.27	4.07	4.14	3.8
2. Were all studer	nts actively encouraged to participate	16	0	4	4	13	8	47	4.18	871/1391	4.18	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.1
3. Did the instruc	ctor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	2	1	3	15	55	4.58	593/1388	4.58	4.56	4.28	4.37	4.5
4. Were special to	echniques successful	15	60	3	1	1	2	10	3.88	****/ 958	****	4.13	3.93	4.00	***
	Seminar														
1. Were assigned t	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 instruc	ctor available for individual attention	91	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	3.00	***
3. Did research pı	rojects contribute to what you learned	91	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.47	****	***
4. Did presentatio	ons contribute to what you learned	91	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.75	4.47	2.00	***
5. Were criteria 1	for grading made clear	91	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.16	4.00	***
	Self Paced														
	acts with the instructor helpful	89	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	****	***
4. Was the feedbac	ck/tutoring by proctors helpful	91	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	3.67	4.37	1.00	***
	Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utic	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	eason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 10	0.00-0.99 1 A 41		Re	quir	ed f	or M	 Major	`====	3	 Graduat	 e	1	Majo	 or	62
28-55 7	1.00-1.99 1 B 34														

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	1	А	41	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	1	Major	62
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	77				
				?	3						

Course-Section: ART 220 0101
Title ART HISTORY I

Instructor: FELDMAN, JOAN

Enrollment: 110
Questionnaires: 63

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 120 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eaue	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		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		****/ 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		****/ 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		0	0	0	1	_	1	4 00	**** OF		4 75	4 50	4 00	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	2	0	0	1	2	1		****/ 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		****/ 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	U	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	2 60	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	58	0	0	0	2	0	3		****/ 53	****	3.87	4.05	4.78	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	58	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.40 ****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	58	3	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 37	****	5.00	4.75	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	58	3	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	****	****
J. Did conferences help you carry out fred accrylities	20	3	U	U	U	Т	Τ	4.50	/ 32		±.50	4.30		
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		****/ 32	****	3.67	4.37	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	4	0	0	0	0	_		****/ 21	****	****		3.00	****
		_	-	-	-	-	_		,					

Course-Section: ART 220 0101
Title ART HISTORY I
Instructor: FELDMAN, JOAN
Enrollment: 110

Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 120 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	1						

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

Instructor: OTTESEN, BODIL Fall 2007

Enrollment: 117 Questionnaires: 66

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 121 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	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		1287/1639		4.38	4.22	4.27	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	4	11	22	26		1018/1397		4.50	4.28	4.39	3.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	4	14	18	24		1039/1583		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		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		1379/1391		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	E 6	9	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 224	****	4.96	1 10	4.33	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	56 59	0	4	1	2	0	0		****/ 240	****	4.60	4.10 4.11	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	6	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 219	****	2.29	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	7	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	58	7	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 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	50 59	3	0	0	0	0	4		****/ 82		5.00	4.50	3.00	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	59	3	0	0	0	2	2		****/ 78	****	4.83	4.47	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	59	5	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 80	****	4.75	4.47	2.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	59	4	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 82		4.63	4.16	4.00	****
or note offeria for grading made offer		-	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	_	1.55	, 02		1.05	1.10	1.00	
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		****/ 53		3.87	4.05	4.28	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	59	5	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 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	****

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

117

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 66

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 121 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	4	Α	21	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	1	Major	28
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	e are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	ignificant	
				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

Fall 2007

Instructor: WORDEN, FRED

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 12

	Evaluation	

Job IRBR3029

							Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	154/1639	4.92	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.92
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.67
		uestions reflec			0	3	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	822/1397	4.22	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.22
4. Did ot	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	536/1583	4.45	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.45
5. Did as:	signed re	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o 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	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	449/1612	4.55	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.55
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.63	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	332/1579	4.56	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.56
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	643/1518	4.64	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.64
2. Did the	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 le	lecture material presented and explained clearl				1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	439/1517	4.64	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.64
4. Did the					1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	388/1550	4.73	4.24	4.22	4.20	4.73
5. Did au	d the lectures contribute to what you learned d audiovisual techniques enhance your understand:				1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	82/1295	4.91	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.91
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	ed 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	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d 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 s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		5	2	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	682/ 958	3.60	4.13	3.93	3.97	3.60
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Туј	pe.			Majors	<b>:</b>
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	8
28-55	1 1.00-1.99 0 B 3							_				_	_	_	_			
56-83	1 2.00-2.99 1 C 0					Gei	nera	Τ				0	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	-major	4
84-150						_						_			_			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0								_	respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					9						

?

0

Course-Section: ART 315 0101

VIDEO I

Title Instructor: GRABILL, VIN

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 8 Baltimore County Fall 2007

University of Maryland

Page 123 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Ran	_	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did vo	ou gain ne	General w insights,skil		this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	3 50	1497/1	630	3.50	4.45	4.27	4.28	3.50
_	_	tor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	3	3		992/1		4.13	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.13
		estions reflect			0	1	0	1	1	4	1		1195/1		3.71	4.50	4.28	4.26	3.71
	_	ations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	792/1		4.25	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.25
			_	what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	3	-		1312/1		3.38	3.99	4.01	4.05	3.38
				what you learned	0	4	0	0	3	0			1212/1		3.50	3.89	4.05	4.12	3.50
		system clearly		_	0	0	1	1	1	1			1279/1		3.75	4.05	4.16	4.12	3.75
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1	635	5.00	4.63	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How wo	ould you g	rade the overal	ll teach	ning effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	889/1	.579	4.00	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.00
		Lecture	<b>e</b>																
1. Were t	the instru	ctor's lectures	s well p	prepared	1	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1237/1	.518	4.00	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.00
2. Did th	ne instruc	tor seem intere	ested in	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1	520	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.68	5.00
				plained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	973/1		4.17		4.27	4.23	4.17
		s contribute to			2	0	0	1	1	1	3		1077/1		4.00		4.22	4.20	4.00
5. Did au	udiovisual	techniques enh	nance yo	our understanding	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	265/1	.295	4.50	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.50
		Discuss																	
		what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	426/1		4.50	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.50		
		d to participate	2 2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	616/1		4.50	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.50		
	the instructor encourage fair and open discussi					0	1	0	0	1		4.17	887/1		4.17		4.28	4.34	4.17
4. Were s	re special techniques successful					4	0	1	0	0	Τ	3.50	725/	958	3.50	4.13	3.93	3.97	3.50
		Laborat			_		_	_	_	_									
		rease understar	_		7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00		224	****	4.96	4.10	4.06	****
2. Were y	you provid	led with adequat	te backs	ground information	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	240	****	4.60	4.11	4.08	****
1 5 1 6		Field W			_	0	0	0	0		0	F 00	<b>1</b> /	F 0	F 00	4 65	4 0 4	4 50	F 00
	_	ience contribut		-	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/	52	5.00	4.67	4.04	4.78	5.00
		r understand you tor available f			6 6	0	1	0	0	1 0	0 2	2.50	49/	53	2.50	3.87	4.05	4.31	2.50
		could you discu			6	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 1/	42 37	5.00 5.00	5.00	4.75 4.58	4.63	5.00 5.00
	_	could you disci help you carry	_		6	0	0	0	0	1	1		17/	32	4.50	5.00 4.50	4.56	4.30	4.50
5. Dia co	Jillerences	neip you carry	y out II	leid activities	6	U	U	U	U	1	1	4.50	1//	34	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.30	4.50
1 Did aa	alf_paged	Self I		what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	50	****	4.79	4.45	5.00	****
	_	cts with the in		_	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	***
J. WEIE )	your conta	icts with the in	isti ucto	or neiprur	,	U	U	U	U	U	_	5.00	/	43		5.00	4.09	3.00	
			Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	utior	1											
Credits E		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3				Тур	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4		Re	 quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors		1	Grad	luate	 e	0	Majo	 or	4	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 3															
56-83	2	C 0		Ger	nera:	l				2	Unde	r-gı	rad	8	Non-	major	4		
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0															
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0 P 0		El	ecti	ves				0			Means t es to b			_	jh
				I O		Ot.	her					5		2.150	1				
				? 0		00.						-							

Course-Section: ART 320 0101 University of Maryland INTRO TO PRINTMAKING Baltimore County

Title Instructor: BOWLER, RUTH S Fall 2007

Enrollment: 12

Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 124

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
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
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	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		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	Τ	Ţ	6	4.63	546/1388	4.63	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	Τ	-/	U	0	U	U	Τ	5.00	****/ 958	****	4.13	3.93	3.97	***

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l 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	В	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 323 0101

Title 20TH CENTURY ART

Instructor: FAGAN, JASON

Enrollment: 46
Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 125 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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		4.38	4.22	4.20	4.49
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	15	21		477/1397		4.50	4.28	4.26	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	2	5	1	8	14		1158/1583		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		3.99	4.01	4.05	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	8		15	4.00	824/1504		3.89	4.05	4.12	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	11	21				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		4.63	4.65	4.66	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	2	1	5	15			989/1579			4.08		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			4.52	4.30	4.35	4.26
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	1	3	18		571/1388		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	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									
				_					_					

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	17	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	С	7	General	5	Under-grad	37	Non-major	16
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 enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	29	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ART 323 0102 University of Maryland Title 20TH CENTURY ART Baltimore County

Instructor: JACOB, PREMINDA Fall 2007

Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 30

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 126 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Overtions		NA	Frequencies			_		tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect	
Questions			 T	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			4.63	4.65		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		****/ 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		****/ 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		****/ 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	****

Course-Section: ART 323 0102
Title 20TH CENTURY ART
Instructor: JACOB, PREMINDA

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 30

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 126 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors	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	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				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

Enrollment: 61 Questionnaires: 28

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

			Fr	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	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		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			3	2	2	2	3		1321/1391	3.00	4.52	4.30	4.35	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16 15	0	4	2	1	2	4	3.00	1320/1388	3.00	4.56	4.28	4.34	3.00

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9	_			
				2	2						

Course-Section: ART 326 0101

HIST. OF PHOTOGRAPHY I

Title

Instructor: STEPHANY, JAROM

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 25

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 128 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	Frequencies			Inst	tructor	Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions		NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	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		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		4.50	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		4.50	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		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		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			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		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		****/ 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		****/ 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			5.00	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, -	****	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													= 05	
Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 50	****	4.79	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24 24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, -	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****
. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful		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

Title HIST. OF PHOTOGRAPHY I

Instructor:

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 25

STEPHANY, JAROM

Fall 2007

Page 128 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 7	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 331 0101 University of Maryland Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful

Baltimore County Instructor: APOSTOLIDES, HE Fall 2007

Enrollment: 20 Ouestionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 129

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 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 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 13 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 1 5 11 4.59 435/1639 3.96 4.38 4.22 4.20 4.59 0 0 1 3 4.75 \*\*\*\*/1397 \*\*\*\* 4.50 4.28 4.26 \*\*\*\* 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 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 3 13 4.81 321/1391 3.91 4.52 4.30 4.35 4.81 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 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 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 80 \*\*\*\* 4.75 4.47 4.65 \*\*\*\* 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 82 \*\*\*\* 4.63 4.16 4.08 \*\*\*\* 5. Were criteria for grading made clear Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 1 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 52 \*\*\*\* 4.67 4.04 4.78 \*\*\*\* 0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 53 \*\*\*\* 3.87 4.05 4.31 \*\*\*\* 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16 0 0 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 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 50 \*\*\*\* 4.79 4.45 5.00 \*\*\*\* 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0 0

#### Frequency Distribution

0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 43 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.69 5.00 \*\*\*\*

16 0

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ART 331 0201 University of Maryland GRAPHIC DESIGN I Baltimore County

Instructor: COATES, JOSEPH Fall 2007

Enrollment: 2.0 Ouestionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 130

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 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 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 3 4 0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/1397 \*\*\*\* 4.50 4.28 4.26 \*\*\*\* 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 00 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1504 \*\*\*\* 3.89 4.05 4.12 \*\*\*\* 0 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 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 0 0 1 0 2 0 15 4.56 1151/1520 4.53 4.87 4.70 4.68 4.56 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 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 0 4 6 4 3.47 1340/1550 3.76 4.24 4.22 4.20 3.47 1 0 3 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 4 2 3 3.00 1321/1391 3.91 4.52 4.30 4.35 3.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 2 4 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 17 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 85 \*\*\*\* 4.75 4.58 4.50 \*\*\*\* 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 82 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.52 4.59 \*\*\*\* 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0 0 Ω 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 78 \*\*\*\* 4.83 4.47 4.60 \*\*\*\* 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 80 \*\*\*\* 4.75 4.47 4.65 \*\*\*\* 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 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 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 52 \*\*\*\* 4.67 4.04 4.78 \*\*\*\* 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16 0 0 2.50 \*\*\*\*/ 53 \*\*\*\* 3.87 4.05 4.31 \*\*\*\* 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 42 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.75 4.63 \*\*\*\* 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 16 1 0 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 \*\*\*\* 16 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 \*\*\*\* 43 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.69 5.00 \*\*\*\* 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	m. GPA Expected Grades			Reasons		Туре	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	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 332 0101 Unive
Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II Ba

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2007

Instructor: CUSTEN, CALVIN (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 131 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Conoral														
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		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			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		****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 78	****	4.83	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 52	****	4.67	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	3.87	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 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
Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II Baltimore County

Instructor: CUSTEN, CALVIN (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

# Frequency Distribution

Fall 2007

Page 131

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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 si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 332 0101

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II
Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 14

(Instr. B) Fall

Fall 2007

Page 132 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	cies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	4.28	4.26	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	239/1583		4.50	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		3.89	4.05	4.12	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	3	-		617/1612		4.05	4.16	4.12	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	9	3		1350/1635		4.63	4.65		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	Ο	4 00	****/ 240	****	4.60	4.11	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 219	****	2.29	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.04	***
Seminar	1.0	•	0	•	0	0	-	F 00		ale ale ale ale	4 55	4 50	4 50	***
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13 13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 78 ****/ 80	****	4.83	4.47	4.60	****
<ol> <li>Did presentations contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Were criteria for grading made clear</li> </ol>	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82		4.75 4.63	4.47 4.16	4.65 4.08	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	13	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 62		4.03	4.10	4.00	
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		****/ 53		3.87	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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
Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II Baltimore County F

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 14

r. B) Fall 2007

Page 132 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

# Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	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 si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 332 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

GRAPHIC DESIGN II Title Instructor: (Instr. C) Fall 2007

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 133 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	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
Diagnasion														
Discussion	_	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	177/1200	1 16	4 27	4 07	1 12	1 11
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5 5	0	0	1 0	0	2 1	6 8		477/1398	4.46	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0					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 5	0	0	0 1	0	1 2	3	4.89	244/1388	4.87	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	U	Τ	U	2	3	4.17	399/ 958	3.98	4.13	3.93	3.97	4.1/
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		****/ 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		****/ 53	****	3.87	4.04	4.76	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.05	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37	****	5.00	4.75	4.63	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	U T		****/ 32		4.50	4.56	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	U	U	U	U	T	U	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.50	4.30	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 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		****/ 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 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II Baltimore County

Instructor: (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 14 Fall 2007

Page 133 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

# Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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 sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Baltimore County Fall 2007

University of Maryland

Page 134

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 13 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ART 332 0102

16

GRAPHIC DESIGN II

CUSTEN, CALVIN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

		Frequencies				Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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			725/1520		4.87	4.70	4.68	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	4			1172/1517		4.43	4.27	4.23	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4			1038/1550			4.22	4.20	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	1	5			731/1295				3.95	
Prince and an														
Discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	_	4 50	406/1200	1 10	4 27	4 07	4.13	4.50
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3		4.50	.,			4.07		
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	•	1		4.90	,		4.52	4.30	4.35	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	5	0	1	0	2	-					4.28	4.34	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	U	Т	۷	Т	Τ	3.40	769/ 958	3.98	4.13	3.93	3.97	3.40
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Gualita Barral Gualar				ъ.										

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 333 0101 University of Maryland Page 135 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN III Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 CAMPBELL, SUSAN Instructor: Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	27

Questionnaires: 26

Ctudent	Course	Fralustion	Ouestionnaire

					Fr	eque:	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you ga	in new insights, skill	s from this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	19	4.73	342/1639	4.73	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.73
1 0	structor make clear t		0	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	241/1639	4.77	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.77
	am questions reflect		0	1	0	1	0	4	20	4.72	323/1397	4.72	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.72
	evaluations reflect t		0	3	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	207/1583		4.50	4.19	4.24	4.78
		e to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	18	4.50	335/1532		3.99	4.01	4.05	4.50
		ute to what you learned	1	19	0	0	0	2	4		****/1504	****	3.89	4.05	4.12	****
	ading system clearly		0	2	0	0	4	6	14	4.42	617/1612	4.42	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.42
	imes was class cancel		1	0	0	0	0	11	14	4.56	1094/1635	4.56	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.56
-		teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	12	9		601/1579		4.26	4.08	4.07	4.30
1 Wassa bloods	Lecture		2	0	0	0	2	2	20	4 75	454/1510	4 75	4 47	1 12	4 20	4 75
	nstructor's lectures s structor seem interes		2	0	0	0	2 1	2 1	20 22	4.75 4.88	454/1518 622/1520	4.75 4.88	4.47 4.87	4.43	4.39 4.68	4.75 4.88
		and explained clearly	2		0	0	2	_	19	4.88		4.88	4.87	4.70	4.08	4.88
	ctures contribute to	-	2	0	0	0	2	2	20	4.75	351/1550		4.43	4.27	4.23	4.71
		nce your understanding		16	0	0	2	1			368/1295				3.95	
5. Did audiov	isuai teciniiques enna	nce your understanding	۷	10	U	U	4	1	5	4.30	300/1293	4.30	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.30
	Discussi	on														
1. Did class	discussions contribut	e 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 s	tudents actively enco	uraged 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 in	structor encourage fa	ir 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 speci	al techniques success	ful	7	5	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	107/ 958	4.79	4.13	3.93	3.97	4.79
		Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
	_	_														
Credits Earne	d Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	.s			Ту:	pe 			Majors	;
00-27 1	0.00-0.99	1 A 22		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	24
28-55 2	1.00-1.99	0 B 1			_			-						_		
56-83 5	2.00-2.99	1 C 1		Ge:	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	26	Non-	-major	2
84-150 4	3.00-3.49	3 D 0														
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00 1	0 F 0		El	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	<sub>J</sub> h
		P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
		I 0		Ot:	her				2	22						
		? 0														

Course-Section: ART 334 0101 University of Maryland GRAPHIC DESIGN IV Baltimore County Fall 2007

Title Instructor: ABRAHAM, GUENET

Enrollment: 32 Questionnaires: 31

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 136 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

						Fr	eque	ncie	S		Inst	ructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ranl	k	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did :	rou gain n	General w insights,skills f	rom this sourse	2	0	0	1	5	1	16	4 10	1068/1	620	4.10	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.10
		ctor make clear the		2	0	0	1	9	6	13		1044/1		4.10	4.45	4.27	4.20	4.10
		lestions reflect the		2	25	0	0	1	1	2		****/1		****	4.50	4.28	4.26	****
		lations reflect the		2	0	0	1	6	7	15	4.24			4.24	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.24
		eadings contribute t		2	24	1	0	2	1	1		****/1!		****	3.99	4.01	4.05	****
			to what you learned	2	11	7	5	3	0	3		1490/1		2.28	3.89	4.05	4.12	2.28
		g system clearly exp		2	4	5	7	6	3	_		1563/1		2.76	4.05	4.16	4.12	2.76
		was class cancelled		4	0	3	6	2	12	4		1607/1		3.30	4.63	4.65	4.66	3.30
	_		aching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	5	9	_		714/1			4.26	4.08		4.21
1		Lecture	, ,		0	•	-	1.0		-	2 01	1045/11	-10	2 01	4 45	4 42	4 20	2 01
		actor's lectures wel		4	0	0	1	10	9	./		1347/1		3.81	4.47	4.43	4.39	3.81
		ctor seem interested		3	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	674/1		4.86	4.87	4.70	4.68	4.86
		terial presented and		4	0	0	1	9	9	8		1193/1		3.89	4.43	4.27	4.23	3.89
		es contribute to wha		4	0	-	3	5	6	13		1043/1		4.07	4.24	4.22	4.20	4.07
5. Did a	audiovisua.	l techniques enhance	your understanding	6	8	2	2	1	4	8	3.82	791/1:	295	3.82	4.50	3.94	3.95	3.82
		Discussion																
1. Did o	class disc	ussions contribute t	o what you learned	3	0	1	1	6	5	15	4.14	708/13	398	4.14	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.14
		nts actively encoura		3	0	0	1	3	6	18	4.46	647/1		4.46	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.46
		ctor encourage fair		3	0	0	2	3	6	17	4.36	771/1		4.36	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.36
		echniques successful		3	16	1	2	3	1	5	3.58	690/	958	3.58	4.13	3.93	3.97	3.58
2 77 1		Field Work		2.0	0	_	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/	40	****	F 00	4 75	4 62	****
3. Was t	tne instru	ctor available for o	onsultation	30	U	0	0	1	U	U	3.00	***/	42	* * * * *	5.00	4.75	4.63	
		Self Paced																
1. Did s	self-paced	system contribute t	o what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	50	****	4.79	4.45	5.00	****
3. Were	your conta	acts with the instru	ctor helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was t	the feedbac	ck/tutoring by proct	ors helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	32	****	3.67	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were	there enou	ugh proctors for all	the students	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****
			Frequ	iencv	Dis	trib	utio	n										
			11040	101107	210	0112	4010											
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	S				Тур	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 15		Re	auir	ed f	or Ma	aior	s	0	Gradı	uate	 e	0	Majo	 or	21
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		100	-1~++	-~ L	J_ 1/10		~	-	Sida		-	-		-	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 1		Ger	nera	1				0	Unde	r-gi	rad 3	31	Non-	-major	10
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 7	D 0										٥-				3 -	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	####	- I	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	<sub>j</sub> h
			P 0											es to b			_	
			I 0		Ot!	her				2	7	-						
			? 3															

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2007

Page 137

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: ART 335 0101 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN V Instructor: FAGAN, JASON

Enrollment: 53 Questionnaires: 44

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	10	14	15	4 OE	1103/1639	4 OE	1 15	4.27	4.28	4 OE
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	2	6	10	22	4.30	,		4.45	4.27	4.20	4.30
	4	0	0	2	0	9	2.3	4.30			4.50	4.22		4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	- 4	12	0	ے 1	5	9	10		1171/1583		4.50	4.19	4.24	3.89
1 3	5 4	12	0	4	2	8	25		377/1532		3.99	4.19	4.24	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	4	2		10	9	25 10		1249/1504		3.89		1.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5 5	0	1	1	Τ0	9	26	4.49	- ,		4.05	4.05	4.12 4.12	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5 4	2	0	Τ	0	9	26 29		, -			4.16 4.65		4.49
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	2	11	14	29 7		869/1635 1200/1579		4.63	4.05		4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	U	U	3	ΤŢ	14	/	3./1	1200/15/9	3./1	4.20	4.08	4.07	3./1
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		1213/1520		4.87	4.70	4.68	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	2	6	11	20		964/1517		4.43	4.27		4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	2	1	2	5	9	22	4.26	, -			4.22	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	1	7	4	24	4.42	337/1295		4.50	3.94	3.95	
5. Dia addiovidual econniques emanee your anderstanding	3	3	Ü	_	,	-		1.12	33771273	1.12	1.50	3.71	3.75	1.12
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	****
Frequ	ıency	Dis	crib	utio	n									

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	38				
				?	5						

Course-Section: ART 341 0101 University of Maryland
Title INTRO TO ANIMATION Baltimore County
Instructor: COOK, CATHY Fall 2007

I 0

1

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 24

24

University of Maryland Page 138
Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

21

							Fre	equer		s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did y	you qain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om 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 t	the instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	1	1	10	12	4.38	722/1639	4.38	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.38
3. Did t	the exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	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 o	other eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	1	1	0	1	6	15	4.48	512/1583	4.48	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.48
5. Did a	assigned r	eadings contrib	ute 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 v	written as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	20	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1504	****	3.89	4.05	4.12	****
7. Was t	the gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	1	0	0	0	5	6	12		756/1612	4.30	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.30
		was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	840/1635		4.63	4.65	4.66	4.78
9. How v	would you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	10	7	4.20	725/1579	4.20	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.20
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	s 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 t	the instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n 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 ma	terial presente	d and e	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 t	the lectur	es contribute t	o 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 a	audiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	2	0	3	19	4.63	209/1295	4.63	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.63
		Discus	sion															
1. Did o	class disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 stude	nts actively en	courage	ed 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 t	the instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd 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 t	echniques succe	ssful		3	8	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	278/ 958	4.38	4.13	3.93	3.97	4.38
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
		0.00.000													1			22
00-27 28-55	0 1	0.00-0.99	0	A 16 B 5		кес	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	ន	0	Graduat	е	1	Majo	)r.	22
28-55 56-83	7	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0 1	В 5 С 1		Cos	nera	1				3	Under-q	rad 1	23	Mo∽	-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0		Ger	uera.	т				٥	onder-9	rau z	د،	NOI1-	-ma Jor	۷
Grad.	3 1	3.50-4.00	5 5	Б 0 F 0		<b>₽</b> 14	ecti	700				0	#### - :	Meane t	here s	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	1	3.30-4.00	5	P 1		ET¢	ECLT,	veb				U	respons				_	111
													-		_			

Other

Course-Section: ART 342 0101 University of Maryland Page 139 Title FILM/VIDEO THEORY & CR Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Instructor: WORDEN, FRED

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 10

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque:	ncie	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions		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 $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($	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
Freq	ıency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	3			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0 00-0 89 0 7 5								·	Graduat		n	Maio	~~~~~	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons	Reasons			Type			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8			
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5									
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	С	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 si	gnificant				
				I	0	Other	10	_						
				2	Λ									

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ART 346 0101 Page 140 Title VIDEO II FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 GRABILL, VIN Job IRBR3029 Instructor: Enrollment: 15

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

? 0

Questionnaires: 12

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m 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 th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	840/1639	4.27	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.27
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	4	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1195/1397	3.71	4.50	4.28	4.26	3.71
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.50
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o 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 th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	1	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	976/1612	4.10	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.10
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	928/1635	4.73	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.73
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	691/1579	4.22	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.22
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1053/1518	4.30	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.30
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	546/1520	4.90	4.87	4.70	4.68	4.90
				xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	947/1517	4.20	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.20
		es contribute t			2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	944/1550	4.20	4.24	4.22	4.20	4.20
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	167/1295	4.70	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.70
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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
				d to participate	2	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	543/1391	4.60	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.60
				d 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 s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	-	2	6	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	895/ 958	2.75	4.13	3.93	3.97	2.75
				Frequ	ıency	, Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arnod	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Po:	asons	,			Ty	20			Majors	
	arneu	Cuiii. GPA											ту.	 pe			Majors 	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors		0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 5														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ge	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		_						_						_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1					ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot]	her					8						

#### Course-Section: ART 350 0101 University of Maryland Page 141 Title FEB 13, 2008

CONSTRUCTED ENVIRONMEN Baltimore County DURANT, MARK Fall 2007

Instructor:

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

		Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	430/1639	4.67	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.67
	0	0	0	0	4	5							4.56
2	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	367/1397		4.50	4.28	4.26	4.67
1	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	355/1583			4.19		4.63
1	2	1	0	2	2	2	3.57		3.57	3.99	4.01	4.05	3.57
ed 2	7	0	0	0	0				****	3.89	4.05	4.12	****
1	5	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1399/1612	3.50	4.05	4.16	4.12	3.50
0	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	691/1635	4.89	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.89
ss 1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	450/1579	4.44	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.44
1	٥	0	Λ	1	1	7	1 67	602/1510	1 67	1 17	1 12	1 20	4.67
1	-	-	•	U T	1	0		,					4.89
	-	-	-	-				,					4.67
	-	-	-	-		7		, -					4.67
-		•	-		_	,		- ,					
Э Т	۷	U	U	U	4	5	4./1	155/1295	4./1	4.50	3.94	3.95	4./1
5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	369/1398	4.60	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.60
5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1391	4.80	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.80
n 5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	328/1388	4.80	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.80
5	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	155/ 958	4.67	4.13	3.93	3.97	4.67
equency	, Dis	strib	utio	n									
es			Re	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	<b>;</b>
	Re	equir	ed f	or Ma	jors	 3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	9
		-											
	Ge	enera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	-major	1
	El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh
	El	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1 respons				_	ŗh
		ectiv her	ves				9					_	rh
	1 1 2 1 1 1 0 0 sss 1 1 1 1 1 0 0 5 5 5 5	1 0 1 0 2 5 1 1 1 2 ed 2 7 1 5 0 1 5 0 1 2 ed 2 7 7 5 0 1 5 0 5 0 6 5 2 equency Dis	NR NA 1  1 0 0 1 0 0 2 5 0 1 1 0 1 2 1 ed 2 7 0 1 5 0 0 1 0 ss 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0	NR NA 1 2  1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 2 5 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 2 1 0 ed 2 7 0 0 1 5 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0	NR NA 1 2 3  1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 2 5 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 5 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0	1 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 4 2 5 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 2 2 ed 2 7 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 0 1 1 1 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 0 1 3  1 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5  1 0 0 0 1 1 7 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 2 5 0 0 0 0 1 2 1 1 0 0 2 2 2 2 1 1 0 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 7 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 5 0 1 1 1 1 0 1 0 0 0 1 3 5  1 0 0 0 1 3 5  1 0 0 0 1 1 7 1 0 0 0 0 1 8 5 1 0 0 0 1 1 7 1 0 0 0 0 1 8 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 2 1 0 0 0 0 2 3 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 5 0 0 0 0 1 4 5 2 0 0 0 1 2  Equency Distribution  Required for Majors	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean  1 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 6 4.63 1 2 1 0 2 2 2 3.57 ed 2 7 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1 5 0 1 1 1 1 3.50 0 1 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 ss 1 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.44  1 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 1 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 1 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 1 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 2 1 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 3 1 2 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.71  5 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 5 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 5 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 5 2 0 0 0 1 2 4.67  equency Distribution  es Reasons  Required for Majors 0	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank  1 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 430/1639 1 0 0 0 0 4 5 4.56 466/1639 2 5 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 367/1397 1 1 0 0 1 1 6 4.63 355/1583 1 2 1 0 2 2 2 3.57 1201/1532 ed 2 7 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1504 1 5 0 1 1 1 1 3.50 1399/1612 0 1 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 691/1635 es 1 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 450/1579  1 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 602/1518 1 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 597/1520 1 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 597/1520 1 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 597/1520 1 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.67 457/1550 eg 1 2 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 369/1398 5 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 369/1398 5 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 332/1391 n 5 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 328/1388 5 2 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 155/ 958  equency Distribution es Reasons Type  Required for Majors 0 Graduate	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean  1 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 430/1639 4.67 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 367/1397 4.67 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 6 4.63 355/1583 4.63 1 2 1 0 2 2 2 3.57 1201/1532 3.57 ed 2 7 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1504 **** 1 5 0 1 1 1 1 3.50 1399/1612 3.50 0 1 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 691/1635 4.89 es 1 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 602/1518 4.67 1 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 597/1520 4.89 1 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 597/1520 4.89 1 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 597/1520 4.89 1 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.67 457/1550 4.67 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 457/1550 4.67 eg 1 2 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 369/1398 4.60 5 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 369/1398 4.60 5 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 332/1391 4.80 5 2 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 155/ 958 4.67  equency Distribution es Reasons Type  Required for Majors 0 Graduate	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean  1 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 430/1639 4.67 4.45 1 0 0 0 0 4 5 4.56 466/1639 4.56 4.38 2 5 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 367/1397 4.67 4.50 1 1 0 0 1 1 6 4.63 355/1583 4.63 4.50 1 2 1 0 2 2 2 3.57 1201/1532 3.57 3.99 ed 2 7 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1504 **** 3.89 1 5 0 1 1 1 1 3.50 1399/1612 3.50 4.05 0 1 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 691/1635 4.89 4.63 ess 1 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 450/1579 4.44 4.26  1 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 602/1518 4.67 4.47 1 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 597/1520 4.89 4.87 1 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 597/1520 4.89 4.87 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 405/1517 4.67 4.43 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 7 7 4.67 457/1550 4.67 4.24 g 1 2 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 155/1295 4.71 4.50  Sequency Distribution es Reasons Type  Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean  1 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 430/1639 4.67 4.45 4.27 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 367/1397 4.67 4.50 4.28 1 1 0 0 1 1 6 4.63 355/1583 4.63 4.50 4.19 1 2 1 0 2 2 2 3.57 1201/1532 3.57 3.99 4.01 ed 2 7 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1504 **** 3.89 4.05 1 5 0 1 1 1 1 3.50 1399/1612 3.50 4.05 4.16 0 1 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 450/1579 4.44 4.26 4.08  1 0 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 450/1579 4.44 4.26 4.08  1 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 597/1520 4.89 4.87 4.70 1 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 597/1520 4.89 4.87 4.70 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 602/1518 4.67 4.43 4.27 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 457/1550 4.67 4.43 4.27 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 457/1550 4.67 4.24 4.22 g 1 2 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 369/1398 4.60 4.27 4.07 5 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 332/1391 4.80 4.52 4.30 n 5 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 332/1391 4.80 4.52 4.30 n 5 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 155/ 958 4.67 4.13 3.93 equency Distribution  Res Reasons Type  Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean  1 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 430/1639 4.67 4.45 4.27 4.28 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 367/1397 4.67 4.50 4.28 4.26 1 1 0 0 1 1 6 4.63 355/1583 4.63 4.50 4.19 4.24 1 2 1 0 2 2 2 3.57 1201/1532 3.57 3.99 4.01 4.05 ed 2 7 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/1504 **** 3.89 4.05 4.12 1 5 0 1 1 1 1 3.50 1399/1612 3.50 4.05 4.16 4.12 0 1 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 691/1635 4.89 4.63 4.65 4.66 es 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 450/1579 4.44 4.26 4.08 4.07  1 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 602/1518 4.67 4.47 4.43 4.39 1 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 597/1520 4.89 4.87 4.70 4.68 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 405/1517 4.67 4.43 4.27 4.23 0 1 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 4.67 405/1517 4.67 4.43 4.27 4.23 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 457/1550 4.67 4.24 4.22 4.20 g 1 2 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 155/1295 4.71 4.50 3.94 3.95  Fequired for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major

Course-Section: ART 351 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County BLACK & WHITE PHOTO

FEB 13, 2008 SILBERG, STEVEN (Instr. A) Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029 Instructor:

Page 142

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Enrollment:	16			
Questionnaires:	16	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

Ρ

I

0

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00 7

						Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions	3		N	IR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 General																	
1. Did voi	ı gain ne	ew insights,skil	-	m this course		4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	231/1639	4.83	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.83
		ctor make clear				4	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.67
		estions reflect				4	2	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.50
	_	ations reflect		_		4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	239/1583	4.75	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.75
		eadings contribu			d	5	0	2	0	0	5	4	3.82	981/1532	3.82	3.99	4.01	4.05	3.82
	_	signments contri		-		5	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	945/1504		3.89	4.05		3.91
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	expla	ined		5	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	681/1612	4.36	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.36
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled			4	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1034/1635	4.64	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.64
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overal	l teac	hing effectiven	ess	7	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	241/1579	4.67	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.67
		Lecture	2																
1. Were th	ne instr		5	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	643/1518	4.64	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.64			
2. Did the			5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	546/1520	4.91	4.87	4.70	4.68	4.91			
		erial presented		_	V	4	0	0	0	0	5	7		498/1517	4.58	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.58
		es contribute to			_	3	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	690/1550	3.23	4.24	4.22	4.20	3.23
		l techniques enh		-	ng	6	1	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	569/1295	4.11	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.11
		Discuss	si on																
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contribu		what vou learne	d	4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	329/1398	4.67	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.67
		nts actively end		-		4	0	0	0	0		11	4.92	204/1391		4.52	4.30	4.35	4.92
		ctor encourage f	_			1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	571/1388		4.56	4.28	4.34	
		echniques succes				4	6	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	563/ 958		4.13	3.93	3.97	3.83
	₽×.								ution	n									
	requer	ic y	DID		20101	-													
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade								Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 1 A 7						Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	`====	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	в 4				-			-						3 -		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0-2.99 0 C 0						1				4	Under-g	rad 1	6	Non-	major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0														-	

Electives

Other

#### Course-Section: ART 351 0101 University of Maryland Page 143 Title BLACK & WHITE PHOTO Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment:

16 Questionnaires: 16

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
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 E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	А	 7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	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 a	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	7	_			
				2	0						

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

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2007

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 144 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment:	9	
Questionnaires:	9	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				т.т.	-quci	LICIC	5		TILD	LIUCCOI	COULDC	. DCpc	OLIDC	псист	DCCC			
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m 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	e instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	pected 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	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the ex	xpected goals	2	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1397	****	4.50	4.28	4.26	****
4. Did ot	her evalı	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	239/1583	4.75	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.75
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute 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
				o what you learned	1	2	2	0	1	1	2		1371/1504		3.89	4.05	4.12	3.17
		g system clearl		ined	1	0	0	1	1	0	6		669/1612		4.05	4.16	4.12	4.38
		was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1045/1635		4.63	4.65	4.66	4.63
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	205/1579	4.71	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.71
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture	s well j	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	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested in	n 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 le	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained 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	e lecture	es contribute t	o 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 au	oid audiovisual techniques enhance your understand						0	0	0	2	6	4.75	135/1295	4.75	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.75
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute 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 a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	525/1391	4.63	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.63
				d 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 s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		1	4	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	841/ 958	3.00	4.13	3.93	3.97	3.00
		Labora	tory															
1. Did the	e lab ind	crease understa	nding o	f the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	4.96	4.10	4.06	****
2. Were ye	ou provid	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.60	4.11	4.08	****
				Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Туј	pe.			Majors	<b>.</b>		
	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4																	
00-27 28-55	0 1	A 4 B 3		Re	quire	ed fo	or M	ajors	\$	0	Graduate	е	0	Majo	or	8		
26-33 56-83	1	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0	в 3 С 0		Co	nera:	1				3	Under-g	rad	9	Non	-major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		GE	ııcı a.	_				J	onder-g.	Luu	,	INOII-	iia jui	_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		E.I	ectiv	765				2	#### - 1	Means +	here a	re not	enous	rh
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						ът	CCLI	v CD				4	response					111
I 0						0+	her					4	T CPPOIIB	-5 CO L	,c 5191.	LLLCai		
? 1						00						-						
	? 1																	

Course-Section: ART 356 0101

Title ALTERNATIVE PROCESSES

TICIC ADIBINATIVE TROCE

 ${\tt Instructor:} \qquad {\tt PEREGOY, CHRIST}$ 

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 9

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

1

F

Ρ

I

0

0

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 145 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Fr	reque	ncie	3		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Se
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Me
	General														
. Did you gain n	ew 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.
. Did the instru	ctor 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.
Did the exam q	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.
Did other eval	uations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	640/1583	4.38	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.
Did assigned r	eadings 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.
Did written as	signments contribute to what you learned	l 1	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1504	****	3.89	4.05	4.12	*:
Was the gradin	g system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	490/1612	4.50	4.05	4.16	4.12	4
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
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
	Lecture														
Were the instr	ructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.47	4.43	4.39	5
	actor 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
	terial presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	299/1517	4.75	4.43	4.27	4.23	4
	res contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1550	5.00		4.22	4.20	
	l techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	459/1295			3.94		4
Did audiovisua	if techniques emiance your understanding	1	U	1	U	U	4	5	4.25	459/1295	4.25	4.50	3.94	3.95	4
	Discussion	0	0		0	0	-	4	4 00	E00/1200	4 00	4 05	4 05	4 12	
	cussions contribute to what you learned	2 1	0	0	0	2	1		4.29	599/1398	4.29	4.27	4.07	4.13	4
	ere all students actively encouraged to participate d the instructor encourage fair and open discussion				0	1	3	4	4.38	719/1391		4.52	4.30	4.35	4
					0	0	2		4.75	387/1388	4.75		4.28	4.34	
Were special t	ere special techniques successful				0	0	1	2	4.67	155/ 958	4.67	4.13	3.93	3.97	4
	Laboratory														
	crease understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 224	****	4.96	4.10	4.06	*
	ded with adequate background information		0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	****	4.60	4.11	4.08	*
Were necessary	materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	2.29	4.44	4.44	*
	Seminar														
Were assigned	topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	*
Was the instru	ctor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.59	*
Did research p	rojects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.47	4.60	*
Did presentati	ons contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.75	4.47	4.65	*
Were criteria	for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.16	4.08	*
	Field Work														
Did field expe	rience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	***	4.67	4.04	4.78	*
	y understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.87	4.05	4.31	*
	Self Paced														
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	*
	Freq	uency	y Dis	strik	outic	n									
edits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades	}			Re	ason	3			Ту	pe			Majors	5
0-27 0	0.00-0.99 0 A 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 1		KE	equir	.ea I	or Ma	ajors	j.	0	Graduat	E	0	Majo	)T.	
8-55 0		~		. 1				2	TT7		0	NT			
6-83 0	2.00-2.99 0 C 1		GE	enera	ŧ⊥				2	Under-g	Lau	9	non-	-major	
	3.00-3.49 2 D 0														

Electives

Other

0

6

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

? 2

Course-Section: ART 359 0101 University of Maryland Title TOPICS IN PHOTOGRAPHY

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 146

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

11010	101100 11.		Dalolmold Country
Instructor:	THOMPSON,	CALLA	Fall 2007
Enrollment:	11		
Questionnaires:	11		Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		om this course	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	188/1639	4.89	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.89
		ctor make clear			2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	142/1639	4.89	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.89
		uestions reflec			2	5	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.50	4.28	4.26	5.00
	_	uations reflect		_	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.50	4.19	4.24	5.00
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o 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 th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	123/1612	4.89	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.89
		was class canc			3	0	0	0	0	8	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.00
				hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.26	4.08	4.07	5.00
		Lectur	۵															
1 Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	_	prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	257/1518	4.88	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.88
		ctor seem inter			3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.68	5.00
	Was lecture material presented and explained clear						0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.23	5.00
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	1	7		208/1550	4.88	4.24	4.22	4.20	4.88
				our understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1295	5.00		3.94	3.95	
		Discus	aion															
1 Did al	acc dica			what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	172/1398	4.89	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.89
				ed to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.52	4.30	4.35	5.00
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	224/1388	4.90	4.56	4.28	4.34	
		echniques succe		d open discussion	2	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	87/ 958				3.97	
4. Wele b	peciai c	eciniiques succe	ssiui		2	2	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	07/ 930	1.00	1,13	3.93	3.91	4.00
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	des Reasons								Туј	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0			Re	auir	ed f	or Ma	iors		0	Graduat	 -	0	Majo	 or	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5		100	-1 CTT.	- L	O 1710	- ,	-	•	Gradad	_	•	11000	-	,
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	GCIICI AI							_	011401 9		_	2.011		-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	ιh
	-	2.22 2.00	_	P 0								-	respons				_	,
				I O	Other						8			3				
				3 0	OCHCI							-						

# Course-Section: ART 360 0101 University of Maryland Title MIXED MEDIA BOOK ARTS Baltimore County

? 2

Title MIXED MEDIA BOOK ARTS Baltimore Count Instructor: CHAN, IRENE Y. Fall 2007

Enrollment: 14

Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 147

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

						Fr	eque	ncie	S		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	248/1639	4.82	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.82
_	-	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	735/1639	4.36	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.36
		uestions reflec			0	10	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1397	****	4.50	4.28	4.26	****
	_	uations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	536/1583	4.45	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.45
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	1	2	1	1	4	1	3.11	1388/1504	3.11	3.89	4.05	4.12	3.11
		g system clearl		_	1	0	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	1253/1612	3.80	4.05	4.16	4.12	3.80
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	10	1		1458/1635		4.63	4.65	4.66	4.09
	-			hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	2		818/1579		4.26	4.08	4.07	4.11
		Lectur	۵															
1 Were ti	he instr	uctor's lecture	_	nrenared	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	213/1518	4.90	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.90
	id the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.68	5.00
	as lecture material presented and explained clear					0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	474/1517	4.60	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.60
	was recture material presented and explained cleari Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	580/1550	4.56	4.24	4.22	4.20	4.56
				our understanding	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	185/1295	4.67	4.50	3.94		4.67
1 5'1 1		Discus			-	0	_	_	-		_	4 40	E11 /1200	4 40	4 00	4 05	4 10	4 40
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	511/1398	4.40	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.40
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	332/1391	4.80	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.80
		_		d 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 s	special to	echniques succe	ssiul		1	3	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	411/ 958	4.14	4.13	3.93	3.97	4.14
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	\$		
00-27									or Ma			0	Graduat		0	Majo		 9
28-55						re	quil	eu I	OT M	a jui	D	U	Graduat	C	U	Ma JC	/ <u>T</u>	J
56-83						Co	nera	1				4	Under-g	rad 1	1	Non	-major	2
	4-150 3 3.00-3.49 2 D 0					Ge.	пета	т.				4	onder-g.	rau I		NOII-	·iiia JUL	4
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0					₽1.	ecti <sup>.</sup>					0	#### - 1	Maana +	here a	re not	enous	rh
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0						E.I.	CCLI	veb				U	respons				_	111
						O+1	her					5	respons	co LU L	e sign	ııııcal.	16	
I 0						UL.	ner					J						

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ART 382 0101 University of Maryland Page 148 INTERACTIVITY FEB 13, 2008 CRAWFORD, BONNI Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	10

Title

Instructor:

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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 Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	 Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	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	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	_			
				2	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 Cour	se Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m 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 th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	840/1639	4.27	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.27
3. Did th	ie exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	696/1397	4.36	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.36
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	654/1583	4.36	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.36
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	9	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1532	****	3.99	4.01	4.05	****
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o 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 th	e grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.00
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	928/1635	4.73	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.73
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	269/1579	4.63	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.63
		Lectur	2															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture		prepared	1	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	1053/1518	4.30	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.30
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.68	5.00
					2	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	917/1517	4.22	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.22
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearl Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	1	1	8	4.70	424/1550	4.70	4.24	4.22	4.20	4.70
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	1	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	185/1295	4.67	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.67
		Discus	ai on															
1 Did al	agg diggs			what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	477/1398	4.44	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.44
				d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	579/1391		4.52	4.30	4.13	4.56
				d open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	702/1388		4.56	4.28	4.34	
		echniques succe		d Open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	190/ 958		4.13	3.93		4.56
i. Were b	peciai ec	cominques succes	JULUI		2	O	O	U	_		O	1.50	100/ 000	1.50	1.15	3.75	3.77	1.50
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7						guir	ed fo	or Ma	ior	 S	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	9
28-55						110	7			- ,	_	-	2_3000	_	-	- 100 ) 0	· <del>-</del>	
56-83						Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	-major	2
84-150													5				3	
Grad.						El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	<sub>j</sub> h
	P 0												respons				_	
				I O		Other				1	.1	-						
				? 1		001101												

Course-Section: ART 389 0101 University of Maryland Page 150 Title TOPICS IN COMPUTER ART Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Instructor: DYER, ERIC G

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 10

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

				Fre	quen	cies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NE	R	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 yo	u learned	1	0	1	0	4	3	1	3.33	1330/1532	3.33	3.99	4.01	4.05	3.33
7. 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 ef	fectiveness 3	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 prepare	d	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 s		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 explaine	_	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 lea	-	1	0	0	1	2	4	2		1228/1550	3.78	4.24	4.22	4.20	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your und		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 yo	u learned '	5	Ο	Ο	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 pa		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		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
	Frequenc	су	Dist	ribu	tion	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expe	cted Grades				Rea	sons				Тур	pe			Majors	į.
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0	 А 5	Required for Major						 3	0	Graduate	 e	0	 Majo	 r	9

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0 Majo	r	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	7	Under-grad 1	.0 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 tl	here are not	enough	
				P	0			responses to be	e significan	.t	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ART 389C 0101

16

SOUND DESIGN

BELL, KATHRYN L

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

Page 151 FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Frequencies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	1303/1639	3.83	4.45	4.27	4.28	3.83
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.67
		uestions reflec			1	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1397	****	4.50	4.28	4.26	****
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.50
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute 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
				o what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	824/1504	4.00	3.89	4.05	4.12	4.00
		g system clearl			0	2	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1305/1612	3.70	4.05	4.16	4.12	3.70
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	1288/1635	4.33	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.33
	-			hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	657/1579	4.25	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.25
		Lectur	۵															
1 Were t	he instr	actor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	807/1518	4.50	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.50
					0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.68	5.00
	id the instructor seem interested in the subject as lecture material presented and explained clearl					0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.50
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42		4.42	4.24	4.22	4.20	4.42
				our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1		4.91	82/1295			3.94	3.95	4.91
		Discus																
1 Did al	000 4:00			what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	1	4.20	675/1398	4.20	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.20
				d to participate	2		0	0	0	4	4 9		227/1391		4.52	4.07	4.13	4.20
				d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	7		459/1388	4.70	4.52	4.28	4.33	4.70
		echniques succe		d open discussion	2	7	1	0	0	3 1	1	3.33	786/ 958		4.13	3.93		3.33
4. Were S	pecial te	eciniques succe	ssiui		4	,		U	U	1	1	3.33	700/ 950	3.33	4.13	3.93	3.97	3.33
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27									or Ma			0	Graduat		0	Majo		9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6		1/6/	quil	cu I	OT 1410	בטנ ג	J	J	Graduat	_	U	Ma JC	, <u>.</u>	J
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Cor	nara	1				4	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non	major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	General								onder -g.	Luu 1	. 4	INOII-	iia jui	ی
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives						0	#### - 1	Meane +	here =	re not	enous	rh	
JI aa.	J	3.30 1.00	5	P 0		Electives					•	respons					)++	
				I O		Other					7	T CBPOILE		,c 5191.	illical			
				1 0		Other						,						

? 0

#### Course-Section: ART 392 0101 University of Maryland Title TOPICS IN ART OR MEDIA Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: ROSENBERG, JASO

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 152

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

					Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski		m 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 th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.67
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.50	4.28	4.26	****
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	323/1583	4.67	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.67
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o 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 th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	3	0	2	1	3.17	1497/1612	3.17	4.05	4.16	4.12	3.17
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.63	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	175/1579	4.75	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.75
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	315/1518	4.83	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.83
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.68	5.00
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearl						0	0	0	2	4	4.67	405/1517	4.67	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.67
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.24	4.22	4.20	5.00
				our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.50	3.94	3.95	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1391	4.80	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.80
				d 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 s	special t	echniques succe	ssful	-	1	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.13	3.93	3.97	5.00
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
G 1		Cum. GPA		Form a set of Consider				ъ.									34 - d	
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				ке:	asons	う 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	; 		
00-27							quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	5	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 3														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nera	1				5	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0							respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt			
				I 0	Other						0							

? 0

#### Course-Section: ART 392C 0101 University of Maryland Page 153 Title INNOVATION AND DESIGN Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Fall 2007 Instructor: YAGER, DAVID

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 6

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Frequencies			Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 L															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil	lls fro	om 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 th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	kpected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	0	3.33	1536/1639	3.33	4.38	4.22	4.20	3.33
4. Did ot	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	186/1583	4.80	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.80
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute 1	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 th	ne grading	g system clearly	expla	ained	0	3	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1595/1612	2.00	4.05	4.16	4.12	2.00
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1001/1635	4.67	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.67
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	889/1579	4.00	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.00
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lectures	s 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 th	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Was le	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	1	4	4.80	239/1517	4.80	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.80
4. Did th	ne lecture	es 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 av	udiovisua	l techniques enl	nance y	your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	109/1295	4.80	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.80
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contribu	ite 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 a	all stude	nts actively end	courage	ed 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 th	ne instru	ctor encourage i	fair a	nd 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 s	special to	echniques succes	ssful	_	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	201/ 958	4.50	4.13	3.93	3.97	4.50
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	5
														<u>.</u> 				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	S	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1													
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General							3	Under-a	rad	6	Non-	-maior	3

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expecte	d 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	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	3	Under-grad	6	Non-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0	General					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				2	Λ						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ART 423 0101

10

ART SINCE 1945

JACOB, PREMINDA

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

Fall 2007

Page 154 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fr	eque:	ncie	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	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	4.2
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 $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($	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	5.0
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	4.5
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	4.8
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	4.8
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	4.4
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	4.6
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
Freq	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6		Re	 auir	ed f	or Ma	aiors	 5	0	Graduat	 е	0	Maic	 or	7

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

#### Course-Section: ART 425 0101 University of Maryland Title WRIT BY & ABOUT ARTIST Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Instructor: MAHONEY, JAMES (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 2

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 155

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque:	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
. 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
. 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
. 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
. 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
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
. Did written assignments contribute to what you learne	0 £	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	367/1504	4.50	3.89	4.05	4.20	4.50
. 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
. 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
. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes	в 0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.26	4.08	4.21	4.50
Lecture														
. 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
. 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
. 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
. 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														
. 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
. 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
. 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
. 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
Fre	quency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	3			Re	ason	S			Туј	pe			Majors	\$

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

#### Course-Section: ART 425 0101 University of Maryland Page 156 FEB 13, 2008

Title WRIT BY & ABOUT ARTIST Baltimore County Instructor: (Instr. D) Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	4		
Questionnaires:	2	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

		Frequencies						Instructor		Course Dept		t 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 Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-	_		
				2	0						

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

Title GRAPHIC DESIGN
Instructor: RE, PEGGY

Instructor: RE, P Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

? 1

University of Maryland Page 157
Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

							Fr	eque	ncie	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	231/1639	4.83	4.45	4.27	4.42	4.83
_	_	ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	252/1639	4.75	4.38	4.22	4.29	4.75
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	9	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1397	****	4.50	4.28	4.38	****
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	323/1583	4.67	4.50	4.19	4.31	4.67
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o 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 th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	2	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	681/1612	4.36	4.05	4.16	4.18	4.36
8. How max	ny times	was class cand	elled		1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	1135/1635	4.50	4.63	4.65	4.72	4.50
				hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	175/1579	4.75	4.26	4.08	4.21	4.75
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s 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 th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n 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 le	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 th	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 au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	4	4	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	221/1295	4.60	4.50	3.94	4.01	4.60
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d 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 th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d 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 s	pecial t	echniques succe	ssful		4	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	240/ 958	4.44	4.13	3.93	4.24	4.44
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	<b>;</b>
	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 8					Red	quir	ea i	or Ma	ajor	S	0	Graduat	е	1	Majo	or	7
28-55					<i>a</i>		,				0	77 J		0	37		_	
56-83					Gei	nera	Т				0	Under-g	rad 1	2	Non-	-major	6	
	34-150 3 3.00-3.49 5 D 0				m <sup>3</sup>						0	ишшш -	Maana +	h			-la	
Grau.	Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 2 F 0				FT.	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### - : respons				_	111	
						O+1	her				1	.1	respons	co LU L	e sign	ııııdı	10	
	I 0					ULI	ner.				1	. ⊥						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ART 431 0101 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN VII Fall 2007 COATES, JOSEPH Instructor:

Page 158 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	13	
Questionnaires:	13	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque:	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	-	0	0	0	2		-	2 00	1500/1600	2 00	4 45	4 00	4 40	2 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	2	3	4	1		1599/1639		4.45	4.27	4.42	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	Τ	3	6	Τ	1		1609/1639		4.38	4.22	4.29	2.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	1	0	0		****/1397		4.50	4.28	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	0	3	4	1		1431/1583		4.50	4.19	4.31	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	1	0	0	0		****/1532		3.99	4.01	4.07	****
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	1	3	3	3	2	1	0	2.11	1594/1612	2.11	4.05	4.16	4.18	2.11
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		1509/1518		4.47	4.43	4.51	2.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	2	5	3		1465/1520		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		1353/1398		4.27	4.07	4.23	2.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	2	3	4	2		1208/1391		4.52	4.30	4.48	3.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	2	3	2	4		1185/1388		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	****
Frem	iencv	nist	trib	ut i o	n									

#### Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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 enougl	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				2	0						

Course-Section: ART 435A 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Title DOC. CINEMA IN 21ST CE Instructor: WORDEN, FRED

Enrollment: 11
Ouestionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 159

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 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 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 9 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.63 4.65 4.72 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  $1 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 9 \quad 5.00$ 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 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 1/1391 5.00 4.52 4.30 4.48 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 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 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 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 52 \*\*\*\* 4.67 4.04 4.84 \*\*\*\* 0 0 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  $9 \quad 0 \quad 0$ 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 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 42 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.75 4.71 \*\*\*\* 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 9 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 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 32 \*\*\*\* 4.50 4.64 \*\*\*\* Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 0.00-0.99 0 A 6 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 2.00-2.99 2 C 0 00-27 0 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 5 28-55 0 C 0 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 2 General 0 Under-grad 10 Non-major 5 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 2 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 D 0 F 0 Electives 2 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other

? 0

#### Course-Section: ART 447 0201 University of Maryland Title 2D ANIMATION/COMPOSITI Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

BELL, KATHRYN L

Instructor:

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 8

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

Page 160

	Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	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 Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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 sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	7	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 484 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County

Page 161

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

ADVNCD 3D COMPUTER ANI Instructor: MCDONALD, NEAL Fall 2007

Enrollment: 25

84-150

Grad.

9

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

4

6

D

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

0

Questionnaires: 17 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Fr	Frequencies			Inst	tructor	Course Dept				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	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	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						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	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	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						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	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	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	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	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	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						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						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						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						4	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	424/ 958	4.13	4.13	3.93	4.24	4.13
Frequency Distribution																		
Crodita Es		Daarana							Type			Modern						
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Reasons								 be		Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Required for Majors					0	Graduat	.e 0		Major		15	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 6														
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		General						0 Under-grad 17				Non-	2	

Electives

Other

0

16

### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 488 0101 University of Maryland Page 162
Title ADV TOPICS: ANIM/IN ME Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Fall 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: BAILEY, DAN

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	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	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	7	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.50	4.19	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned						6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1532	****	3.99	4.01	4.07	***
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned						6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1504	****	3.89	4.05	4.20	***
7. Was the grading system clearly explained						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	7	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.63	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ning 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						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						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						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						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						0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1295		4.50	3.94		5.00
or and contained the contained four and contained													,					
		Discus																
				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						0	0	0	1	0	3		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		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																		
Trequency Protrough																		
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Reasons								ype Maj			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Required for Majors				 5	0	Graduat	Graduate 0		Major		6	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0	<u>.</u>													
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		General						4	Under-g	rad	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 en					_	jh
	P 0										responses to be significant							
				I 0		Other						2						
				? 0														

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ART 489A 0101

11

TIME-BASED MEDIA

DYER, ERIC G

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

Page 163 FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

			and the second second
Ctudant	Course	Fraluation	Ouestionnaire

					Frequen			ncies	3	Instructor		cructor	Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect	
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did y	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m 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 t	he instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	859/1639	4.25	4.38	4.22	4.29	4.25
3. Did t	he exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	2	1	0	0	5	3.63	1238/1397	3.63	4.50	4.28	4.38	3.63
4. Did o	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	155/1583	4.88	4.50	4.19	4.31	4.88
5. Did a	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute 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 w	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o 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 t	he grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	603/1612	4.43	4.05	4.16	4.18	4.43
8. How m	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1257/1635	4.38	4.63	4.65	4.72	4.38
9. How w	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	760/1579	4.17	4.26	4.08	4.21	4.17
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	529/1518	4.71	4.47	4.43	4.51	4.71
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	674/1520	4.86	4.87	4.70	4.75	4.86
				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
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass disc			what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	599/1398	4.29	4.27	4.07	4.23	4.29
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	279/1391		4.52	4.30	4.48	4.86
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	276/1388		4.56	4.28	4.50	4.86
		echniques succe		a open arboabbien	1	2	0	0	2	0	3		380/ 958		4.13			4.20
				Frequ	ona	. Dia	t wib	1+101	2									
				riequ	lency	DIS	CLID	10101	.1									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	es Reasons								Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r )r	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2			-			-						3 -		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0									J				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I O		Otl	her					8	_		_			
				? 0														

Course-Section: ART 494 0103 University of Maryland INTERNSHIP Baltimore County

Questionnaires: 1

Page 164 Title FEB 13, 2008 Instructor: COOK, CATHY Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 1

	Frequencies					Instructor			Course Dept		ot 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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

#### Course-Section: ART 495 0125 University of Maryland Page 165 Title INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: PEREGOY, CHRIST

Enrollment: 1

Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies					Instructor		tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	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	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	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	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	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

Credits Ea	arned Cum. GPA			Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	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	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-	-		
				_	0						

Course-Section	: ART 495 (	0129	University o	f Maryland	Page	166
Title	INDEP STUD	IO RESEARCH	Baltimore	County	FEB 13,	2008
	G			0000	- 1	

Instructor: Job IRBR3029 CHAN, IRENE Y. Fall 2007

Questionnaires:	1	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Enrollment:

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	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	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

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

#### Course-Section: ART 495 0146 University of Maryland Page 167 Title INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

WORDEN, FRED

Instructor: 1

Enrollment: 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	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	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

Credits Ea	s Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	d 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	В	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 sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 610 0101 Un

IMAG. DIGITAL SEMINAR Baltimore Count

Title IMAG. DIGITAL SE Instructor: BRADLEY, STEPHE

Enrollment: 7
Questionnaires: 7

7 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 168
Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

	Questions						Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Ran		Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 54		Genera			0	0	^	1	1	2	_	2 06	1000/1	c 2 0	2 06	4 45	4 07	4 40	2.06
		v insignts,ski tor make clear		om this course	0	0	0	1 0	1 2	3 3	2		1289/1 1090/1		3.86 4.00	4.45	4.27	4.42 4.26	3.86 4.00
		estions reflec		_	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1		5.00	4.50	4.22	4.20	5.00
	_	ations reflect			0	2	0	0	3	1	1		1367/1		3.60	4.50	4.19	4.31	3.60
				what you learned	0	2	1	0	3	0	1		1421/1		3.00	3.99	4.01	4.10	3.00
				o what you learned	0	4	0	0	2	0	1		1116/1		3.67	3.89	4.05	4.29	3.67
		system clearl		_	0	2	0	0	3	1	1		1360/1		3.60	4.05	4.16	4.27	3.60
		vas class canc		.11104	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	,		4.86	4.63	4.65	4.81	4.86
	-			ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	1	0		1420/1		3.25	4.26	4.08	4.17	3.25
		Lectur	e																
1. Were th	ne instruc	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1237/1	518	4.00	4.47	4.43	4.49	4.00
2. Did the	e instruct	or seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1	520	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was led	cture mate	erial presente	d and e	explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	1376/1	517	3.43	4.43	4.27	4.32	3.43
4. Did the	e lectures	s contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	1	4	0	2	3.43	1360/1	550	3.43	4.24	4.22	4.23	3.43
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	1	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	894/1	295	3.67	4.50	3.94	3.95	3.67
		Discus	sion																
				what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1030/1	398	3.67	4.27	4.07	4.22	3.67
				ed to participate	1 1	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	752/1		4.33	4.52	4.30	4.47	4.33
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discuss Were special techniques successful						0	0	0	2	4	4.67	496/1		4.67	4.56	4.28	4.49	4.67
4. Were sp	pecial tec		1	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	155/	958	4.67	4.13	3.93	4.01	4.67		
1. Were as	ssigned to	pics 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
				lividual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/	82	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.74	5.00
	_	-		what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	45/	78	4.50	4.83	4.47	4.52	4.50
		ns contribute			5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	58/	80	4.00	4.75	4.47	4.50	4.00
5. Were ci	riteria fo	or grading mad	e clear	•	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/	82	5.00	4.63	4.16	4.37	5.00
		Field																	
	_			hat you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	52	****	4.67	4.04	3.64	****
_	_	_		uation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	53	****	3.87	4.05	4.03	****
		or available			6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	42	****	5.00	4.75	4.78	****
	_	-	_	r evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.00		37	****	5.00	4.58	4.33	****
5. Did cor	nterences	help you carr	y out f	field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	32	****	4.50	4.56	4.59	***
	Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	utio	n													
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	asons					Тур	e			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	3	 А б		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	 3	0	Grad	 uate	: :	5	Majo	 r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1			_			-							3 -		
56-83						Ger	nera:	1				0	Unde	r-gr	ad	2	Non-	major	7
84-150																			
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	####	- M	leans t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
P 0													resp	onse	s to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
	I 0											7							
	3 0 1 0																		

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Course-Section: ART 620 0101

7

HIST I&D ARTS

MAHONEY, JAMES

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 6

Page 169 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions						Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 General	 I															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,skil		this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	231/1639	4.83	4.45	4.27	4.42	4.83
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	177/1639	4.83	4.38	4.22	4.26	4.83
		uestions reflect			0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.50	4.28	4.37	5.00
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.50	4.19	4.31	5.00
		eadings contribu			0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	335/1532	4.50	3.99	4.01	4.10	4.50
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	138/1504	4.83	3.89	4.05	4.29	4.83
		g system clearly			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.05	4.16	4.27	5.00
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.63	4.65	4.81	5.00
				ing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	137/1579	4.80	4.26	4.08	4.17	4.80
		Lecture	9															
		uctor's lectures	_	-	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	315/1518	4.83	4.47	4.43	4.49	4.83
. Did th	e instruc	ctor seem intere	ested 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 le	cture mat	terial presented	d and ex	plained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	214/1517	4.83	4.43	4.27	4.32	4.83
l. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to	what y	ou learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	253/1550	4.83	4.24	4.22	4.23	4.83
5. Did au	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi					0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	529/1295	4.17	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.17
	Discussion																	
		ussions contribu		-	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	200/1398	4.83	4.27	4.07	4.22	4.83
		nts actively end			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.52	4.30	4.47	5.00
				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 s	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		0	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	119/ 958	4.75	4.13	3.93	4.01	4.75
		Seminar			_						_	= 00				. =0	. = 0	
	_	topics relevant			5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.58	****
				vidual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.74	***
	_	rojects contribu		-	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 78	****	4.83	4.47	4.52	***
_		ons contribute t		you learned	5 5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	4.75	4.47	4.50	****
). Were c	riteria 1	for grading made	e clear		5	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.16	4.37	***
	Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n												
Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27						Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors		0	Graduat	 e	3	Majo	 or	0
28-55																		
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0						Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	-major	6
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0																		
Grad.						El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
				P 0									respons					
		_								_	-							

Other

5

Ι

?

0

0

Course-Section: ART 638 0129
Title TEACH PRACTICUM
Instructor: PEREGOY, CHRIST
Enrollment: 1

Questionnaires: 1

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 170 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

							ncies				ructor	Course	_			Sect		
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	.1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om 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 th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.38	4.22	4.26	5.00
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	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 ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.63	4.65	4.81	5.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s 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 th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	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 le	cture ma	terial presente	d 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 th	e lectur	es contribute t	o 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 au	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi						0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.50	3.94	3.95	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	ed 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 th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.56	4.28	4.49	5.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 1		Per	 mir	 ed f	or Ma	ior		0	 Graduat		0	Majo		0
28-55	0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0					1/6/	4u11	cu I	J⊥ 1*10	، ٢٠٠٢	ی	U	Graduat	-	J	ria JC	) <u>+</u>	U
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				1	Under-q	rad	1	Non-	-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		061	c. a.	-				_	Jiidel -g	Luu	_	14011		_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Electives						0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	ıh
0144.	ŭ	3.33 1.00	-	P 0	Eleccives							•	respons				_	,
				I O		Other						0	10000110		.c bigi			
				3 0		Other						ŭ						
			. 0															

Course-Section: ART 640 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

IMAGING & DIGITAL STUD Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN (Instr. A) Fall 2007

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 171

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 3 1 4.25 890/1639 4.25 4.45 4.27 4.42 4.25 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 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 4.31 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
8. How many times was class cancelled 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 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 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 2 2 4.50 265/1295 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 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 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 1/ 82 5.00 5.00 4.52 4.74 5.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 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 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 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 3 A 4 Required for Majors 0 Graduate Major 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 В 0 56-83 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 0 Ω General Under-grad 0 Non-major 4 84-150 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 4 3.50-4.00 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other

Course-Section: ART 640 0101 University of Maryland Title IMAGING & DIGITAL STUD Baltimore County

AL STUD Baltimore County (Instr. B) Fall 2007

Instructor:
Enrollment: 7

Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 172 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

								ncies	3		Inst	tructo	r	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rai	nk	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,skills fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	890/	1639	4.25	4.45	4.27	4.42	4.25
_	-	ctor make clear the e		0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1090/	1639	4.00	4.38	4.22	4.26	4.00
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions 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 ot	her evalı	uations reflect the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	476/	1583	4.50	4.50	4.19	4.31	4.50
5. Did as	signed re	eadings 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 wr	itten ass	signments 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
		g system clearly expl	ained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	- ,			4.05	4.16	4.27	4.25
8. How man	ny 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	e lecture	es 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 cla	ass discu	ussions 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
		nts actively encourag		0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	393/	1391	4.75	4.52	4.30	4.47	4.75
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage fair a	nd 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 s	pecial te	echniques successful		0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	307/	958	4.33	4.13	3.93	4.01	4.33
		Laboratory																
		crease understanding		3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		224		4.96	4.10	4.43	5.00
3. Were no	ecessary	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																
	_	topics relevant to th		3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	85		4.75	4.58	4.58	5.00
		ctor available for in		3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	82		5.00	4.52	4.74	5.00
	_	rojects contribute to	_	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	78		4.83	4.47	4.52	5.00
		ons contribute to wha		3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	80		4.75	4.47	4.50	5.00
5. Were c	riteria 1	for grading made clea	r	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	e feedbac	ck/tutoring by procto	rs helpful	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	27/	32	3.00	3.67	4.37	4.31	3.00
			Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3				Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 3	A 4		Per	anir	 ed f	or Ma	ior		0	Grad	duat		4	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	В 0		1/6/	2u11	-u 1	OT 1.10	، عال م	_	5	GLA	aua c	_	-	ria J		U
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Unde	er-g	rad	0	Non-	-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0										٠.				3	
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00 0	F 0		Ele	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	###:	# - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	rh
	P 0											es to b			_			
			I 0		Otl	her					4							
			? 0															

Course-Section: ART 720A 0101

WRTNG BY & ABOUT ARTIS

Title WRTNG BY & ABOU

Instructor: MAHONEY, JAMES

Enrollment: 5
Questionnaires: 5

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 173 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level 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		5.00	1/1550	5.00		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		, -	****	4.60	4.11	3.96	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 219	****	2.29	4.44	4.23	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.58	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.74	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 78	****	4.83	4.47	4.52	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	4.75	4.47	4.50	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	U	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		****/ 52	****	4.67	4.04	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	3.87	4.05	4.03	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.78	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 50	****	4.79	4.45	4.39	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32	***	5.00	4.51	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		, -	****	5.00	4.69	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4 4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32 ****/ 21	****	3.67	4.37 4.52	4.31	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	/ 21			4.52	4.42	

Course-Section: ART 720A 0101

Title WRTNG BY & ABOUT ARTIS

Instructor: MAHONEY, JAMES

Enrollment: 5
Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 173 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 740 0101
Title ADV. I&D STUDIO
Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN

6

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 174 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Student	COULSE	Evaluation	Ouescronnarie

					Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	tructor	<u>-</u>	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rar	ık	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1																
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	w insights,ski		m this course	1	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1622/1	L639	2.80	4.45	4.27	4.42	2.80
_	_	tor make clear			1	0	1	0	1	1	2		1444/1		3.60	4.38	4.22	4.26	3.60
		estions reflect			1	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/]	L397	****	4.50	4.28	4.37	****
	_	ations reflect		-	2	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1532/1	L583	3.00	4.50	4.19	4.31	3.00
5. Did as	signed rea	adings contrib	ute to i	what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	633/1		4.20	3.99	4.01	4.10	4.20
6. Did wr	ritten ass	ignments contr	ibute to	what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1259/1	L504	3.40	3.89	4.05	4.29	3.40
7. Was th	ne grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1399/1	L612	3.50	4.05	4.16	4.27	3.50
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1396/1	L635	4.20	4.63	4.65	4.81	4.20
9. How wo	ould you g	rade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	3	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1565/1	L579	2.33	4.26	4.08	4.17	2.33
		Lecture	e																
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture:	s well j	prepared	1	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	1141/1	L518	4.20	4.47	4.43	4.49	4.20
2. Did th	ne instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	1115/1	L520	4.60	4.87	4.70	4.79	4.60
3. Was le	ecture mate	erial presented	d and ex	xplained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1083/1	L517	4.00	4.43	4.27	4.32	4.00
4. Did th	ne lecture	s contribute to	o what	you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	944/1	L550	4.20	4.24	4.22	4.23	4.20
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	221/1	L295	4.60	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.60
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	770/1	L398	4.00	4.27	4.07	4.22	4.00	
2. Were a	all studen	d to participate	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1192/1	L391	3.60	4.52	4.30	4.47	3.60		
3. Did th	re all students actively encouraged to particip d the instructor encourage fair and open discus					0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	944/1	L388	4.00	4.56	4.28	4.49	4.00
4. Were s	special te	chniques succes	ssful		1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	958	****	4.13	3.93	4.01	****
		Labora	tory																
1. Did th	ne lab inc	rease understa	nding o	f the material	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	224	****	4.96	4.10	4.43	****
2. Were y	ou provid	ed with adequat	te back	ground information	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	240	****	4.60	4.11	3.96	****
3. Were n	necessary i	materials avai	lable f	or lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	219	***	2.29	4.44	4.23	****
		Semina	r																
	-	-		announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/	85	5.00	4.75	4.58	4.58	5.00
				ividual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/	82	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.74	5.00
	-	_		what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/	78	****	4.83	4.47	4.52	****
_		ns contribute t		you learned	4	0	0	0	0 1	0 1	2	5.00	1/ 64/	80 82	5.00 3.50	4.75	4.47	4.50 4.37	5.00
J. WEIC C	5. Were criteria for grading made clear						-		-	_	Ü	3.30	01/	02	3.30	1.05	1.10	1.57	3.30
		Frequ	ency.	Dist	crib	utior	ı												
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	asons					Тур	pe			Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	 5	0	Grad	duate	e 	0	Majo	r or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1															
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Unde	er-gr	rad	6	Non-	major	6
84-150																			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0			Means t			_	h
	P 0												resp	onse	es to b	e sigr	nificar	ıt	
	I 0						ner					4							
		? 1																	

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ART 790 0126

1

IND. STUDIES

WORDEN, FRED

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

Fall 2007

Page 175 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Instru	actor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	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

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