Course-Section: ART 210 1 University of Mary:
Title Visual Concepts Baltimore County
Instructor: Chan, Irene Fall 2009

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

17

University of Maryland Page 65
Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010
Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaire

	±				Inst	tructor	Course Dep		UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	2	11	1	3.63	1359/1509	4.14	4.34	4.31	4.34	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	8	2	2	3.00	1463/1509	3.96	4.23	4.26	4.32	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1287	4.73	4.39	4.30	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	843/1459	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	7	3	4	1	0	1.93	1403/1406	3.06	3.81	4.09	4.09	1.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	2	8	0	1	2.57	1368/1384	3.36	3.67	4.11	4.09	2.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	6	1	5	3	3.19	1385/1489	3.70	3.97	4.17	4.19	3.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	762/1506	4.91	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	6	5	0	3.15	1367/1463	3.87	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	1185/1438	4.53	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	1	13	4.63	1060/1421	4.73	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	5	7	1	3.38	1313/1411	4.10	4.31	4.31	4.37	3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	5	4	5	3.63	1234/1405	4.12	4.31	4.32	4.39	3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	2	2	4	2	3	3.15	1102/1236	3.94	4.42	4.00	4.11	3.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	8	3	3.86	888/1260	3.92	4.18	4.14	4.19	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	3	3	6	3.93	974/1255	4.31	4.41	4.33	4.37	3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	910/1258	4.42	4.47	4.38	4.44	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	610/ 873	3.73	4.11	4.03	4.04	3.75
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trik	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 7 8								2	Craduat		0	Maio		10

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	7
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 210 2
Title Visual Concepts

Title Visual Concepts
Instructor: Moren,Lisa

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 66 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	- 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1					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	3	5	7	4.06	1072/1509	4.14	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	932/1509	3.96	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1287	4.73	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	6	8	4.33	686/1459	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1406	3.06	3.81	4.09	4.09	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	3	5	2	2	2.93	1339/1384	3.36	3.67	4.11	4.09	2.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	2	2	6	4	3.86	1141/1489	3.70	3.97	4.17	4.19	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1506	4.91	4.60	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	3	8	4	3.94	944/1463	3.87	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	762/1438	4.53	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	1014/1421	4.73	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	1020/1411	4.10	4.31	4.31	4.37	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	2	8	4.00	1047/1405	4.12	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	7	7	4.27	481/1236	3.94	4.42	4.00	4.11	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	2	4	4	3.54	1034/1260	3.92	4.18	4.14	4.19	3.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	1	2	8	4.23	796/1255	4.31	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	660/1258	4.42	4.47	4.38	4.44	4.46
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	681/ 873	3.73	4.11	4.03	4.04	3.57

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	10	
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	5							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	6	
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	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	0	_				
				?	0							

Visual Concepts

Title Visual Conc Instructor: Moren,Lisa

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 67 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			Fre	_	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	2	7	1 22	000/1500	4.14	1 21	4.31	4.34	4 22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1 1	2	5	7 4		800/1509 1086/1509	3.96	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	9	0	0	0	2	1		****/1287	4.73	4.23	4.20	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	770/1459	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	9	0	0	2	1	0		****/1406		3.81	4.09	4.09	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	3	3	4	1		1282/1384		3.67	4.11	4.09	3.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	2	0	2	4	4		1236/1489	3.70	3.97	4.17	4.19	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1506	4.91	4.60	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	7	2	3.83	1036/1463	3.87	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	348/1438	4.53	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	933/1421	4.73	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	867/1411	4.10	4.31	4.31	4.37	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	798/1405	4.12	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	211/1236	3.94	4.42	4.00	4.11	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	746/1260	3.92	4.18	4.14	4.19	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	665/1255	4.31	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	792/1258	4.42	4.47	4.38	4.44	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	1	0	5	1	3.86	560/ 873	3.73	4.11	4.03	4.04	3.86
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.46	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	***	4.35	4.06	2.88	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.25	4.41	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 46	****		4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			

? 0

Course-Section: ART 210 4 University of Ma
Title Visual Concepts Baltimore Cou
Instructor: Gardner, Symmes Fall 200

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 11 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland	Page 68	8
Baltimore County	MAR 22, 2010	0
Fall 2009	Job IRBR3029	9

	Questions				NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 544		Genera	_		0	0	0	0	0	_	_	4 55	FF1 /1F00	4 1 4	1 21	4 21	1 21	4 55
		w insights,ski tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	5 4	6 7	4.55 4.64	551/1509 390/1509		4.34	4.31	4.34	4.55 4.64
		estions reflec			0	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	326/1287	4.73	4.23	4.30	4.35	4.70
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	96/1459	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.91
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	665/1406		3.81	4.09	4.09	4.18
	-	-		o what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	225/1384		3.67	4.11	4.09	4.67
		system clearl			0	1	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	917/1489		3.97	4.17	4.19	4.10
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	762/1506	4.91	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.82
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	286/1463	3.87	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.56
		Lectur	е															
		ctor's lecture			1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	545/1438	4.53	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.70
		tor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	537/1421	4.73	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.90
				xplained clearly	2	0 0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	416/1411	4.10	4.31	4.31	4.37	4.67
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand						0	0	1	3	6	4.50	634/1405		4.31	4.32	4.39	4.50
5. Did aud	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi						1	0	1	4	2	3.75	853/1236	3.94	4.42	4.00	4.11	3.75
		Discus																
				what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	597/1260		4.18	4.14	4.19	4.29
				d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	443/1255		4.41	4.33	4.37	4.67
				d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	299/1258		4.47	4.38	4.44	4.86
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	sstul		4	5	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 873	3.73	4.11	4.03	4.04	****
		Self																
		system contrib cts with the i		what you learned	10 10	0	0	0	0 1	0	1	3.00	****/ 49 ****/ 46	****	3.67 4.00	4.26 4.31	4.33	****
3. Were yo	our conta	icts with the i	nstruct	or Heibrar	10	U	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	/ 40		4.00	4.31	4.00	
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors			
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 7							ed fo	or Ma	ior	 S	 6	Graduat	 e	0	Majo		5
28-55										J								-
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	major	6
84-150																		
Grad.						Ele	ecti	ves			2 #### - Means there are not enoug				h			
	P 1					responses t					es to b	e sign	ifican	t				
I 0						Otl	her					1						
	? 0																	

Visual Concepts II/Cam

Title Thompson, Calla

Instructor:

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 69 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

		0						equei		s			tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s 		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	563/1509	4.59	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.53
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	201/1509	4.64	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.80
3. Did th	e exam que	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	7	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	857/1287	4.32	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.14
4. Did ot	her evalua	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	280/1459	4.73	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.67
5. Did as	signed rea	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	4	2	3.33	1258/1406	3.79	3.81	4.09	4.09	3.33
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	1	0	0	9	3	2	3.50	1192/1384	3.71	3.67	4.11	4.09	3.50
7. Was th	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	513/1489	4.32	3.97	4.17	4.19	4.47
		was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	12	2	4.14	1325/1506	4.36	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.14
9. How wo	ould you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	381/1463	4.43	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.46
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	363/1438	4.72	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.80
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1421		4.77	4.73	4.76	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3		4.80	,		4.31	4.31	4.37	4.80
		s contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80			4.31	4.32	4.39	4.80
				our understanding	0	0	0	0	0				100/1236					
J. DIG au	alovisaai	ceciniiques en	nance y	our understanding	U	U	U	U	U	3	12	1.00	100/1230	1.72	7.72	4.00	4.11	1.00
			_				_	_										
		what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	582/1260		4.18	4.14	4.19	4.30		
				d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1255	4.68	4.41	4.33	4.37	5.00
	. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussio				5 5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	236/1258			4.38	4.44	
4. Were s	1. Were special techniques successful					1	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	600/ 873	3.90	4.11	4.03	4.04	3.78
		Labora	tory															
1. Did th	e lab inc	rease understa	nding o	f the material	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were y	ou provid	ed with adequa	te back	ground information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
				or lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did th	e lab ins	tructor provid	e assis	tance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
		Semina	r															
1. Were a	ssigned to			announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.88	4.49	5.00	****
		Field	Marala															
1. Did fi	eld exper			hat you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	4.75	4.75	4.39	4.79	****
	_			_														
1 Did se	Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learne					0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 49	3 67	3 67	4 26	4.33	****
i. Dia se	.ii pacca i	ByBeem Concilib	acc co	what you rearried	14	O	O	O	O	_	O	1.00	/ 12	3.07	3.07	1.20	1.55	
	F							ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	es Reasons								Ту	pe			Majors	3
00 07	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А 9	Required for Majors 1					1								
00-27	0-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 8-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 5					кес	quire	ea I	or M	ajor	s I	.1	Graduat	е	0	Majo)r	6
						~ -		1				0	TT7		_	NT		^
	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0					Gei	nera:	T				0	Under-g	rau l	.5	non-	-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1 1	D 0 F 0		-						2	инии -	Maana +	.b			-lo
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	Τ	F 0 P 0	Electives					2 #### - Means there are not enough					111			
				= -	Other					responses to be significant								
I 0 Other							U											

University of Maryland

Visual Concepts II/Cam Baltimore County Fall 2009

Thompson,Calla 15 Instructor:

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 15

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 70 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	953/1509	4.59	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	116/1509	4.64	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	2	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	803/1287	4.32	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1459	4.73	4.32	4.22	4.30	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1001/1406	3.79	3.81	4.09	4.09	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	4	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	807/1384	3.71	3.67	4.11	4.09	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	0	1	1	8	4.70		4.32	3.97	4.17	4.19	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	10	1		1349/1506		4.60	4.67	4.61	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	410/1463	4.43	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	497/1438	4.72	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1421	4.90	4.77	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1411	4.68	4.31	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	273/1405		4.31	4.32	4.39	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	67/1236	4.72	4.42	4.00	4.11	4.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	308/1260	4.49	4.18	4.14	4.19	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	321/1255	4.68	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1258	4.81	4.47	4.38	4.44	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	209/ 873	3.90	4.11	4.03	4.04	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	***	4.18	4.56	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 89	****	4.88	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.94	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 90	****	4.85	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.46	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	***	4.35	4.06	2.88	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	4.75	4.75	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	4.25	4.25	4.41	4.50	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 47	4.75	4.75	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 47	4.67	4.67	4.18	4.56	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	4.33	4.33	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 49	3.67	3.67	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 46	4.00	4.00	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****

Visual Concepts II/Cam

Instructor: Thompson, Calla

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 15

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 70 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	1						

Visual Concepts II/Cam

Instructor: Silberg,Steven

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 16

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 71 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Question	S		NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		se Dept n Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera																
1 Did you	u dain ne	Genera w insights,ski	_	om this course	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	201/150	9 4.5	9 4.34	4.31	4.34	4.86
		ctor make clear			2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	459/150				4.32	4.57
		estions reflec			2	1	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	,			4.30	4.35	4.54
		ations reflect			2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	- ,				4.30	4.64
				what you learned	2	0	1	2	1	5	5	3.79	1023/140			4.09	4.09	3.79
				to what you learned	2	0	0	1	5	5	3	3.71	1076/138	4 3.7	1 3.67	4.11	4.09	3.71
		g system clearl			2	0	0	1	2	8	3	3.93	1082/148	9 4.3	2 3.97	4.17	4.19	3.93
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		2	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1014/150	6 4.3	6 4.60	4.67	4.61	4.57
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	511/146	3 4.4	3 4.12	4.09	4.08	4.36
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	617/143	8 4.7	2 4.38	4.46	4.48	4.64
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	665/142	1 4.9	0 4.77	4.73	4.76	4.86
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	351/141	1 4.6	8 4.31	4.31	4.37	4.71
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to	o what	you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	393/140	5 4.6	5 4.31	4.32	4.39	4.71
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	187/123	6 4.7	2 4.42	4.00	4.11	4.64
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	520/126	0 4.4	9 4.18	4.14	4.19	4.38
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	3	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	494/125	5 4.6	8 4.41	4.33	4.37	4.62
				nd open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	312/125	8 4.8	1 4.47	4.38	4.44	4.85
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		3	9	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	442/ 87	3 3.9	0 4.11	4.03	4.04	4.00
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading made	e clear	2	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 9	3 ***	* 4.35	4.06	2.88	****
		Field	Work															
1. Did fi	eld exper	rience contribu	te to v	what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 4	8 4.7	5 4.75	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you	u clearly	y understand you	ur eval	luation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 4	8 4.2	5 4.25	4.41	4.50	****
4. To what	t degree	could you disc	uss you	ır evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 4	7 4.6	7 4.67	4.18	4.56	****
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	ribu	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			т	уре			Majors	:
										- 								,
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s 1	0	Gradua	te	1	Majo	or	10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 5		~						0	1	,	1.5			_
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera!	L				0	Under-	grad	15	Non-	-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		m3						2	ишши	Maar	+ b			-la
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F 0 P 0		E⊥€	ectiv	/es				3			there			311
				P 0		0+1						1	respon	ses to	be sig	nilcai	16	

Other

I 0

1

Course-Section: ART 211 4 University of Maryland Title Visual Concepts II/Cam

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 72

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 15 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Silberg,Steven

3.50-4.00

Instructor:

Grad.

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 5'1		General	_	. 1 .		0	0	-	0	-	_	1 6 1	446/1500	4 50	4 2 4	4 21	4 2 4	1 6 1
_	_	ew insights,ski			4	0	0	Ţ	0	1	9	4.64	446/1509		4.34		4.34	4.64
		ctor make clear			4	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	838/1509	4.64	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.27
	_	uestions reflect		_	4	1	0	0	U T	5	4	4.30	739/1287	4.32	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.30
		uations reflect			4	0	1	2	1	1	9	4.55	410/1459	4.73	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.55
				what you learned	6	•	1	∠ 1	1	1	4		1159/1406	3.79		4.09	4.09	3.56
		_		to what you learned	6 6	0	1	0 T	1 2	2	4		1036/1384	3.71	3.67	4.11	4.09	3.78
		g system clearly	_	inea	•	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.11	906/1489 1030/1506	4.32	3.97 4.60	4.17 4.67	4.19 4.61	4.11
	_	was class cance		-1-i	6	0	0	0	-	4 6	5		,					
9. How wou	ia you g	grade the overa.	ıı tead	ching effectiveness	5	1	U	U	0	ь	3	4.33	545/1463	4.43	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.33
		Lecture																
1 Word th	o inatm	actor's lectures		nwanawad	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.73	497/1438	4.72	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.73
		ctor seem inter			4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.73	933/1421	4.72	4.30	4.73	4.46	4.73
				explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	5 5	4	4.18	943/1411	4.68	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.18
		es contribute to			4	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.16	798/1405	4.65	4.31	4.31	4.37	4.16
				you rearned your understanding	4	0	0	1	٥	4	6	4.36	392/1236		4.42	4.00	4.11	4.36
J. Did aud	IOVISUA.	r ceciniiques em	iance y	our understanding	4	U	U	1	U	4	O	4.30	392/1230	4.72	4.42	4.00	4.11	4.30
		Discus	nion															
1 Did ala	ee diea			what you learned	5	0	0	1	Λ	2	7	4.50	415/1260	4.49	4.18	4.14	4.19	4.50
				ed to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	412/1255	4.68	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.70
		-	_	nd open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	792/1258		4.47	4.38	4.44	4.30
		echniques succes		d open discussion	5	4	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	705/ 873		4.11	4.03	4.04	3.50
T. WEIE SP	eciai c	ecinitques succes	bblui		J	-	_	U	2	_	2	3.30	7037 073	3.70	4.11	1.03	1.01	3.30
				Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	utior	1									
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	\$	9	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6													_	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	l				0	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														

Electives

Other

2

0

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

0

0

0

1

Ρ

I ?

Title

University of Maryland

Visual Concepts II/Cam Baltimore County Farrell, John Fall 2009

Instructor: Farrell,John

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 73 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fro	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	339/1509	4.59	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	390/1509		4.23	4.26	4.32	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	638/1287	4.32	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	146/1459	4.73	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	389/1406	3.79	3.81	4.09	4.09	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	3	0	4	3.56	1168/1384	3.71	3.67	4.11	4.09	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	597/1489	4.32	3.97	4.17	4.19	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	1118/1506	4.36	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	294/1463	4.43	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	497/1438		4.38	4.46	4.48	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.91	537/1421		4.77	4.73	4.76	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3		4.73	339/1411		4.31	4.31	4.37	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	596/1405		4.31	4.32	4.39	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	67/1236	4.72	4.42	4.00	4.11	4.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	352/1260		4.18	4.14	4.19	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	749/1255		4.41	4.33	4.37	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1258		4.47	4.38	4.44	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	630/ 873	3.90	4.11	4.03	4.04	3.71
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 177		****	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 89		4.88	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92		4.94	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 90		4.85	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92		4.46	4.38	4.00	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	19/ 48	4.75	4.75	4.39	4.79	4.75
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	32/ 48	4.25	4.25	4.41	4.50	4.25
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	23/ 47	4.75	4.75	4.51	4.83	4.75
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	20/ 47		4.67	4.18	4.56	4.67
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	26/ 44	4.33	4.33	4.32	4.67	4.33
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	42/ 49		3.67	4.26	4.33	3.67
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 41		****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	31/ 46		4.00	4.31	4.00	4.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 37		****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Visual Concepts II/Cam

Instructor: Farrell,John

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 11

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 73 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: ART 212 1 University of Maryland Title Visual Concepts III/3D Baltimore County

Instructor: Young, Shannon

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 15

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 74

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

			Eze	equei		~		Tnat	miatox	Course	Dont	TIMDO	T orrol	Coat
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	eque.	icte	5 1	5		ructor Rank	Course	Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect
Quescions	MK	IVA	Τ.		3	4	5	Mean	Ralik	Mean	меап	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	1214/1509	3.91	4.34	4.31	4.34	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1221/1509	3.90	4.23	4.26	4.32	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	7	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	519/1287	4.50	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	715/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	8	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1406	3.23	3.81	4.09	4.09	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	5	4	0	2	0	0	1.67	1384/1384	2.54	3.67	4.11	4.09	1.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	1169/1489	3.82	3.97	4.17	4.19	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	983/1463	3.84	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1166/1438	4.38	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1195/1421	4.52	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1153/1411	4.06	4.31	4.31	4.37	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1047/1405	3.89	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	489/1236	4.28	4.42	4.00	4.11	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	701/1260	4.05	4.18	4.14	4.19	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	484/1255	4.41	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	535/1258	4.39	4.47	4.38	4.44	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 873	3.83	4.11	4.03	4.04	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	utio	n									

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 212 2 University of Maryland Title Visual Concepts III/3D Baltimore County

Instructor: Young, Shannon

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 12

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 75

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	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	2	0	0	1	5	3	1	3.40	1425/1509	3.91	4.34	4.31	4.34	3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	4	5	0	0	2.40	1502/1509	3.90	4.23	4.26	4.32	2.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	9	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1287	4.50	4.39	4.30	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1271/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.30	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1369/1406	3.23	3.81	4.09	4.09	2.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	5	1	1	0	1	1.88	1383/1384	2.54	3.67	4.11	4.09	1.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	4	3	1	0	2.44	1470/1489	3.82	3.97	4.17	4.19	2.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	3	4	2	0	2.70	1432/1463	3.84	4.12	4.09	4.08	2.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	1358/1438	4.38	4.38	4.46	4.48	3.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	1345/1421	4.52	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	2	2	4	0	2.80	1386/1411	4.06	4.31	4.31	4.37	2.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	0	2	3	2	3.10	1341/1405	3.89	4.31	4.32	4.39	3.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	4	4	1	3.50	984/1236	4.28	4.42	4.00	4.11	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	958/1260	4.05	4.18	4.14	4.19	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	851/1255	4.41	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	0	1	2	2		1193/1258	4.39	4.47	4.38	4.44	3.29
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 873	3.83	4.11	4.03	4.04	****

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

Course-Section: ART 212 3 University of Maryland Title

Visual Concepts III/3D Baltimore County Shiflet, Nicole Fall 2009

Enrollment: 15

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 15 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			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	5	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	482/1509	3.91	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1509	3.90	4.23	4.26	4.32	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	4.50	4.39	4.30	4.35	***
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	247/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	2	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	1128/1406	3.23	3.81	4.09	4.09	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	3	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	978/1384	2.54	3.67	4.11	4.09	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1489	3.82	3.97	4.17	4.19	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	271/1463	3.84	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.57
. 3														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1438	4.38	4.38	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1421	4.52	4.77	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1411	4.06	4.31	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	788/1405	3.89	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	126/1236	4.28	4.42	4.00	4.11	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	370/1260	4.05	4.18	4.14	4.19	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1255	4.41	4.41	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	299/1258	4.39	4.47	4.38	4.44	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	585/ 873	3.83	4.11	4.03	4.04	3.80
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	;

Page 76

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	1						

ART 212 4 University of Maryland

Visual Concepts III/3D Baltimore Cour

Shiflet, Nicole Fall 20

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 11

Title

Instructor:

Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 77 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	s 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	0	0	Ο	1	3	5	2	3 73	1314/1509	3.91	4 34	4.31	4.34	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	742/1509		4.23	4.26	4.32	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	313/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	2	3	3.27	1276/1406	3.23	3.81	4.09	4.09	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	2	0	2	2	2.78	1356/1384	2.54	3.67	4.11	4.09	2.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	986/1489	3.82	3.97	4.17	4.19	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	690/1463	3.84	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.20
<u>. </u>														
Lecture	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4 00	363/1438	4.38	4 20	4.46	4.48	4.80
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	υ Τ	0	0	0	1	2	8		1049/1421	4.52	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	∠ 5	8	4.55			4.77	4.73	4.76	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	2	6		1005/1411		4.31	4.31	4.37	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	4	7		193/1236		4.42	4.00	4.11	
5. Did additional techniques childree your understanding	O	O	U	U	U	-	,	1.01	100/1200	1.20	1.12	1.00	1.11	1.01
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	924/1260	4.05	4.18	4.14	4.19	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1001/1255	4.41	4.41	4.33	4.37	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	398/1258	4.39	4.47	4.38	4.44	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	560/ 873	3.83	4.11	4.03	4.04	3.86
Laboratory				_	•		_					4 00		
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	Τ	0	0	0		****/ 198		****	4.22		****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.25	4.41	4.50	****
From	0000	Diat	- wib.	.+	-									

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

Course-Section: ART 213 1 University of Maryland Title Visual Concepts IV/4D

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 78

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 10 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Valiente,Christ

Instructor:

Quescionnailes: 10 Scudenc cou														
			Fre	equei	ncie	3		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	Λ	Λ	Λ	1	2	1	6	4 20	942/1509	4.36	4.34	4 31	4 34	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	5		1013/1509		4.23	4.26	4.32	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	0	2		****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	, -	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	1	1	2		1140/1406		3.81	4.09	4.09	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	-,		3.67	4.11	4.09	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	4	4		1106/1489		3.97	4.17	4.19	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	5	4		1222/1506		4.60	4.67	4.61	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	853/1463	4.28	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	1203/1438		4.38		4.48	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	,		4.77	4.73	4.76	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	810/1411	4.56	4.31	4.31	4.37	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	708/1405	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	73/1236	4.87	4.42	4.00	4.11	4.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	701/1260	4.22	4.18	4 14	4.19	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	. ,		4.41	4.33	4.37	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	- ,		4.47	4.38	4.44	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 873		4.11	4.03	4.04	****
	_	•	_	-	-	-	-		, 3,3	- ·				
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	า									

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

Visual Concepts IV/4D

Instructor:

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 13

Title

Nohe, Timothy

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 79 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NTD	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie:	s 1	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Quescions								Mean			Mean	Mean	Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	0	2	8	4.08	1065/1509	4.36	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	507/1509	4.35	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	335/1459	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	446/1406	3.67	3.81	4.09	4.09	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1384	3.89	3.67	4.11	4.09	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	986/1489	4.07	3.97	4.17	4.19	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1258/1506	4.52	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	248/1463	4.28	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	497/1438		4.38	4.46	4.48	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92		4.82	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	520/1411	4.56	4.31	4.31	4.37	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1		4.67	,		4.31	4.32	4.39	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	67/1236	4.87	4.42	4.00	4.11	4.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	505/1260	4.22	4.18	4.14	4.19	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	749/1255	4.64	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	363/1258	4.73	4.47	4.38	4.44	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	570/ 873	4.42	4.11	4.03	4.04	3.83
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.46	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.25	4.41	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	4.67	4.18	4.56	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	4.33	****
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	5
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	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Visual Concepts IV/4D

Title Visual Concep Instructor: Mayhew, James

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 80 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies	3 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	244/1509	4.36	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	699/1509	4.35	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	803/1459	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1333/1406	3.67	3.81	4.09	4.09	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	1192/1384	3.89	3.67	4.11	4.09	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	707/1489	4.07	3.97	4.17	4.19	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1506	4.52	4.60	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	628/1463	4.28	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.25
Lecture														
	2	0	0	0	1	2	_	4 56	727/1/20	1 12	4 20	1 10	4 40	4.56
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	6 8	4.56 4.78	737/1438 846/1421	4.43 4.82	4.38 4.77	4.46 4.73	4.48 4.76	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	279/1411	4.82	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.78	587/1405	4.56	4.31	4.31	4.37	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	Τ	0	Τ.	8	4.80	100/1236	4.87	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	U	U	U	U	2	8	4.80	100/1236	4.87	4.42	4.00	4.11	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	701/1260	4.22	4.18	4.14	4.19	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	229/1255	4.64	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	274/1258	4.73	4.47	4.38	4.44	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 873	4.42	4.11	4.03	4.04	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	4.25	4.41	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 47	****	4.67	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.33	4.32	4.67	***

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there a	are not enough	ī
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	1						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ART 214 1 Drawing I

Questionnaires: 10

Page 81 Title MAR 22, 2010 Shafie, Hadieh M Instructor: Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1044/1509	4.41	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	0	5	3.60	1331/1509	4.22	4.23	4.26	4.32	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.35	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1111/1459	4.23	4.32	4.22	4.30	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1406	2.60	3.81	4.09	4.09	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	3	0	2	1	2.44	1470/1489	3.33	3.97	4.17	4.19	2.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	1346/1506	4.10	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	5	2	1	3.50	1241/1463	3.99	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.50
Lecture														
	2	0	1	1	1	2	2	2 (2	1252/1420	4 00	4 20	1 10	4.48	2 (2
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	Τ	Τ	1	2	5		1353/1438		4.38	4.46		3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	5		1162/1421	4.68	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	Ι	Ι	4		1157/1411	4.34	4.31	4.31	4.37	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	1	3		1265/1405	4.19	4.31	4.32	4.39	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1236	4.21	4.42	4.00	4.11	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	936/1260	4.16	4.18	4.14	4.19	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	575/1255	4.47	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	620/1258		4.47	4.38	4.44	
Frequ	iency	Dis	tribu	ution	1									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	3	Required for Majors	7	Graduate (0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad 10	.0	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means th	here ar	re not enough	
				P	0			responses to be	e signi	ficant	
				I	0	Other	0	_	_		
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Kissack,Lyle 16 Instructor:

Course-Section: ART 214 2

Drawing I

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 14

Title

Page 82 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	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														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	698/1509	4.41	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	828/1509	4.22	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	1	1		****/1287	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	792/1459	4.23	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1389/1406	2.60	3.81	4.09	4.09	2.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1384	3.71	3.67	4.11	4.09	***
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	2	4	2	2	2	2.83	1430/1489	3.33	3.97	4.17	4.19	2.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	11	2	4.00	1383/1506	4.10	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	628/1463	3.99	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1182/1438	4.08	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	1	0	11	4.54	1138/1421	4.68	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	580/1411	4.34	4.31	4.31	4.37	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	1	8	4.31	859/1405	4.19	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	0	2	1	5	3.70	883/1236	4.21	4.42	4.00	4.11	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	597/1260	4.16	4.18	4.14	4.19	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	762/1255	4.47	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1083/1258	4.40	4.47	4.38	4.44	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	610/ 873	3.82	4.11	4.03	4.04	3.75
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.46	4.38	4.00	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	2.88	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	Ο	3.50	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 48	****	4.25	4.41	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 4 7	****	4.67	4.18	4.56	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	Λ	3.50	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 46	****	4.00	4.31	4.00	****
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		-	_	-	_	_	٠		, 10					

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	14	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-		_	
				2	1						

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Course-Section: ART 214 3 University of Maryland Drawing I MAR 22, 2010 Shellow,Leslie Job IRBR3029

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 83

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Questionnaires: 17 Student Course Evaluation Questionnair	Ouestionnaires:	17	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnair
---	-----------------	----	---------	--------	------------	--------------

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

18

	Questions						1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did voi	ı gain ne	w insights,ski	_	m this course	3	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	351/1509	4.41	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.71
		ctor make clear			3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	223/1509	4.22	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.79
		estions reflec			3	10	0	0	0	1	3		****/1287	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.35	****
		ations reflect			3	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	,	4.23	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.57
				what you learned	3	11	0	0	0	1	2		****/1406	2.60	3.81	4.09	4.09	****
	_	-		o what you learned	3	0	0	1	6	3	4	3.71	1076/1384	3.71	3.67	4.11	4.09	3.71
		system clearl		-	3	0	0	0	1	2	11		224/1489	3.33	3.97	4.17	4.19	4.71
		was class cance			3	0	0	0	0	11	3	4.21	1287/1506	4.10	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.21
				hing effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	7	6	4.21	668/1463	3.99	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.21
		Lectur	_															
1 Wara th	no inatro	actor's lecture		nronarod	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	762/1438	4.08	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.54
		tor seem inter			4	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1421	4.68	4.30	4.73	4.46	5.00
					4	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	482/1411	4.34	4.31	4.31	4.37	4.62
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clear 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	3	10	4.77	333/1405	4.19	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.77
							0	0	1	1	9	4.73	142/1236		4.42		4.11	
J. DIG auc	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand						U	U		1	,	1.75	142/1230	7.21	1.12	1.00	4.11	1.73
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	460/1260	4.16	4.18	4.14	4.19	4.45
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	474/1255	4.47	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.64
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1258	4.40	4.47	4.38	4.44	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		6	2	0	0	5	0	4	3.89	545/ 873	3.82	4.11	4.03	4.04	3.89
				Frequ	anas	, Die	tri hı	1+101	2									
				rredo	iency	DIS	CIID	20101	.1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Typ	e			Majors	5
00-27	 2	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	quir	ed fo	or M	aior	s	6	Graduate		0	Majo		6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3			1			5	_	-		-	-	5	_	-
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nera:	l				1	Under-gr	ad 1	.7	Non-	major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	_													
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives					3	#### - N	leans t	here a	re not	enoug	jh		
				P 0								response	es to b	e sign	ifican	t		
				I 0		Otl	her					0						
				0 0														

University of Maryland

Intro To Art & Media Baltimore County

Durant, Mark R Fall 2009

Enrollment: 148
Questionnaires: 133

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

 Maryland
 Page
 84

 ounty
 MAR 22, 2010

 009
 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fr 1	reque 2	encie 3	es 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	28	0	3	6	13	31	52	4.17	964/1509	4.17	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	28	0	3	6	23	20	53	4.09	1027/1509	4.09	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	30	81	1	1	4	4	12	4.14	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	27	15	5	6	12	16	52	4.14	877/1459	4.14	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	29	21	3	3	17	20	40	4.10	746/1406	4.10	3.81	4.09	4.09	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1 27	4	2	7	20	23	50	4.10	756/1384	4.10	3.67	4.11	4.09	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	28	2	2	5	18	18	60	4.25	760/1489	4.25	3.97	4.17	4.19	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	27	2	1	0	0	9	94	4.88	642/1506	4.88	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	38	4	1	3	12	36	39	4.20	690/1463	4.20	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	28	0	0	0	6	12	87	4.77	413/1438		4.38	4.46	4.48	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	28	0	0	1	5	12	87	4.76	863/1421	4.76	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	3	2	10	10	79	4.54	580/1411		4.31	4.31	4.37	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	29	1	3	5	10	11	74	4.44			4.31	4.32	4.39	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	31	0	0	2	6	6	88	4.76	121/1236	4.76	4.42	4.00	4.11	4.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	60	0	8	6		13	30	3.70	968/1260		4.18	4.14		3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	59	0	5	6	12	18	33	3.92	983/1255		4.41	4.33	4.37	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	59	0	3	0	11	13	47	4.36	749/1258		4.47	4.38	4.44	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	59	55	4	1	3	3	8	3.53	****/ 873	****	4.11	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory	101	0	•	•	0	0	0	2 00	**** / 100	als als als als	****	4 00	4 -1	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1 131	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	130	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89		4.88	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	131	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,		4.94	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	131	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 90		4.85	4.50	****	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	131	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	130 131	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.55	****/ 48 ****/ 48		4.75	4.39	4.79 4.50	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	131	U	U	U	2	U	U	3.00	^^^^/ 48	^^^	4.25	4.41	4.50	
Self Paced	120	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 40		2 67	4 06	4 22	***
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	132	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	4.33	****
Free	quency	Dis	strik	outio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	5			Re	eason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 9 0.00-0.99 1 A 65		Re	 quir	red f	or M	 Tajor	:	 31	 Graduat	 e	1	Majo	 or	60
28-55 17 1.00-1.99 0 B 30			_			J						5		
56-83 8 2.00-2.99 5 C 1		Ge	enera	al				4	Under-g	rad 13	32	Non-	-major	73
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 8 D 0														
Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 8 F 0		El	.ecti	ives				9	#### -				_	jh
P 1									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
I 0		Ot	her					2						
? 3														

Course-Section: ART 220 1 Title Art History I Instructor:

Feldman,Joan S

Enrollment: 127 Questionnaires: 75

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 85 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	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	2	0	1	2	6	0.1	4.2	1 11	711/1500	1 11	1 21	4.31	4.34	4.41
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	2 1	8	21 19	43 44	4.41	711/1509 667/1509		4.34	4.31	4.34	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3 2	1 5	1 2	1 2	3 9	19	47 29	4.55	481/1287	4.55	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	∠ 5	5 5				26		4.15	877/1459		4.32	4.22	4.30	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	-		3	5	12	18	27	3.94	897/1406	3.94	3.81	4.09	4.09	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	1	2	5	15	25	22	3.87	970/1384		3.67	4.11	4.09	3.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	3	10	16	40	4.30	707/1489	4.30	3.97	4.17	4.19	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	0	9	60	4.87	662/1506	4.87	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	3	0	1	7	30	21	4.20	678/1463	4.20	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	1	18	52	4.67	588/1438	4.67	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	4	67	4.92	483/1421	4.92	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	3	4	25	39	4.36	779/1411	4.36	4.31	4.31	4.37	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	3	16	48	4.53	615/1405	4.53	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	2	0	2	11	54	4.67	176/1236	4.67	4.42	4.00	4.11	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	1	10	1 2	20	2 00	702/1260	2 00	1 10	1 11	4 10	2 00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28 28	0	1	4	10	12 13	20 22	3.98 4.15	782/1260 851/1255	3.98 4.15	$4.18 \\ 4.41$	4.14	4.19 4.37	3.98 4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	1	1	5	10	30	4.13	700/1258	4.13	4.41	4.38	4.44	4.13
-	28 29	33	4	3	5 5	10	0		****/ 873	4.43	4.47	4.38	4.44	4.43 ****
4. Were special techniques successful	29	33	4	3	5	1	U	2.23	****/ 8/3		4.11	4.03	4.04	
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	73	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	72	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	***	****	4.36	4.65	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	72	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.88	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	72	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 92	****	4.94	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	72	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.85	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	72	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.46	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	72	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	70	0	1	0	2	2	0	2 00	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.79	****
-	70	0	0	0	1	1	-		****/ 48	****				****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3. Was the instructor available for consultation	70	2	0	0	1	0	3 2	4.40	****/ 47	****	4.25 4.75	4.41 4.51	4.50 4.83	****
		2	0	0	U T	0				****				****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	71	۷	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	****/ 47		4.67	4.18	4.56	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	72	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	72	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	72	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.00	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	72	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****

Course-Section: ART 220 1
Title Art History I
Instructor: Feldman, Joan S

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 85 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 127
Questionnaires: 75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	 А	36	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	В	22						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	26	Under-grad	75	Non-major	55
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	8	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_		-	
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 221 1 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County Art History II Fall 2009

Ottesen,Bodil B Instructor:

Enrollment: 121 Questionnaires: 117

Page 86 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	ane	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	30	0	2	1	19	29	36	4.10	1044/1509	4.10	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	30	0	1	6	20	41	19	3.82	1221/1509	3.82	4.23	4.26	4.32	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	30	1	0	6	15	35	30	4.03	911/1287	4.03	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	31	6	2	5	16	37	20	3.85	1127/1459	3.85	4.32	4.22	4.30	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	30	1	3	7	11	27	38	4.05	783/1406	4.05	3.81	4.09	4.09	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	31	2	3	3	21	33	24	3.86	978/1384	3.86	3.67	4.11	4.09	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	31	1	2	1	26	29	27	3.92	1094/1489	3.92	3.97	4.17	4.19	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	30	2	0	0	0	15	70	4.82	742/1506	4.82	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	46	2	0	0	16	45	8	3.88	998/1463	3.88	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	35	0	0	0	7	22	53	4.56	725/1438	4.56	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	33	0	0	1	0	8	75	4.87	639/1421		4.77	4.73	4.76	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	36	0	0	2		37	29	4.15	971/1411		4.31	4.31	4.37	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	1	11	19	52	4.47			4.31	4.32	4.39	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	32	3	1	2	9	13	57	4.50			4.42	4.00	4.11	4.50
J. Did addiovisual techniques emance your understanding	22	5	1	2	,	13	37	4.50	2/4/1250	4.50	1.12	4.00	7,11	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	66	0	8	7	12	13	11		1125/1260		4.18	4.14	4.19	3.24
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	67	0	8	6	18	8	10		1198/1255		4.41	4.33	4.37	3.12
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	67	0	4	3	13	17	13		1110/1258		4.47	4.38	4.44	3.64
4. Were special techniques successful	67	38	4	0	5	0	3	2.83	****/ 873	****	4.11	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	107	8	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	108	0	3	1	1	2	2	2.89	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
	108	7	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	109	5	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	108	7	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 165	***	****	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	108	3	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.88	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	108	1	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	****/ 92	****	4.94	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	109	1	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	****/ 90		4.85	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	109	3	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/ 92		4.46	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	109	2	0	1	2	1	2		****/ 93		4.35	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
	100	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.13	****/ 48	****	4 7 5	4 20	4 70	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	109	0	1 0	1 2	4	-	2		,		4.75	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	109	0			2	2		3.50	****/ 48	****	4.25	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	110	6	0	0	0	1 1	0	4.00	****/ 47 ****/ 47	****	4.75	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	109	3 7	0	-	3 1	_	1		,		4.67	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	108	,	U	0	Τ	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.33	4.32	4.67	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	110	0	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	108	5	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	109	4	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 46		4.00	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	108	7	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	108	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: ART 221 1
Title Art History II
Instructor: Ottesen, Bodil B

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 86 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 121 Questionnaires: 117

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors	
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	3	 А	29	Required for Majors	45	Graduate 0	Major	35
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	0	В	43					
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	5	C	12	General	29	Under-grad 117	Non-major	82
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	1					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	8	#### - Means ther	e are not enoug!	h
				P	0			responses to be s	ignificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-	-	
				?	0					

Course-Section: ART 305 1 University of Maryland Page 87 Title Film I: Moving Images Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Enrollment: 13

Worden,Frederic Fall 2009 Questionnaires: 13 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Fre	equei	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															
1. Did you gain new i		om this course	4	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	673/1509	4.44	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.44
2. Did the instructor			4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56		4.56	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.56
3. Did the exam quest		_	4	5	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	779/1287	4.25	4.39	4.30	4.33	4.25
4. Did other evaluati			4	1	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	770/1459	4.25	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.25
5. Did assigned readi		_	5	5	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1406	****	3.81	4.09	4.12	****
6. Did written assign	-	-	5	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1132/1384	3.63	3.67	4.11	4.15	3.63
7. Was the grading sy		-	5	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	760/1489	4.25	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.25
8. How many times was			5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	642/1506	4.88	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.88
9. How would you grad		ching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	628/1463	4.25	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.25
		3									,					
	Lecture															
1. Were the instructo	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	4	5	4.56	737/1438	4.56	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.56
2. Did the instructor	seem interested	in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture materi	al presented and	explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	689/1411	4.44	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.44
4. Did the lectures of	contribute to what	you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	321/1405	4.78	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.78
5. Did audiovisual te	echniques enhance	your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	73/1236	4.89	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.89
	-															
	Discussion															
1. Did class discussi	ons contribute to	what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1260	****	4.18	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students	actively encourage	ed to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1255	****	4.41	4.33	4.37	***
3. Did the instructor	r encourage fair a	nd open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1258	****	4.47	4.38	4.42	***
	-															
	Frequ	uency	Dis	tribu	ution	n										
Credits Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors		

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

Course-Section: ART 315 1 University of Maryland Video I

Title Baltimore County Grabill, Vincent Instructor: Fall 2009

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 13

_			
Ctudant	Course	Fraluation	Questionnaire
bludent	COULSE	Evaluation	Quescionnaire

Page 88

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

				_	ncies		_		tructor		e Dept		Level	
Questions	NR	NA 	1	2 	3 	4	5 	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	3	2	3	3	3.55	1387/150	9 3.55	4.34	4.31	4.32	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1221/150	9 3.82	4.23	4.26	4.25	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	6	2		1069/128		4.39	4.30	4.33	3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	2	0	6	2		1167/145		4.32	4.22	4.26	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	4	2	2		1303/140		3.81	4.09	4.12	3.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	3	1	2	2	0		1378/138		3.67	4.11	4.15	2.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2 2	0 1	0	1	3	4	3		1169/148		3.97	4.17	4.14	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	1	3	0 4	10 1	5.00	1/150 1323/146		4.60 4.12	4.67 4.09	4.67 4.08	5.00 3.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	۷	Т	1	Т	3	4	1	3.30	1323/140	3 3.30	4.12	4.09	4.00	3.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1032/143	8 4.30	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1084/142	1 4.60	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	4	4		1000/141		4.31	4.31		4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	4	2		1241/140		4.31	4.32	4.32	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	664/123	6 4.00	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	1021/126	0 3.57	4.18	4.14	4.22	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	851/125		4.41	4.33	4.37	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	932/125	8 4.00	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 87	3 ****	4.11	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	4 ****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 19		****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 18	4 ****	****	4.48	4.52	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 17	7 ****	****	4.36	4.30	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	1	0	Ο	3.00	****/ 9	2 ****	4.94	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 9		4.85	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 9		4.46	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 9	3 ****	4.35	4.06	3.94	****
mini di manda														
Field Work	10	^	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 4	Q ****	4 75	4 20	1 (1	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12 12	0	0	0	1	1 0	0	1.00	****/ 4 ****/ 4		4.75 4.25	4.39	4.61 4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 4		4.25	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 4		4.67	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 4	•	4.33	4.32	4.40	****
		-	-	-	_	-	-		, -					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 4		3.67	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 4		****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0 1	1 0	0	0	3.00	****/ 4 ****/ 3		4.00	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12 12	0	0	0 T	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 3 ****/ 3		****	4.05	5.00 5.00	****
5. Were there enough products for all the students	12	U	U	U	Т	U	U	3.00	/ 3	0	*	4.2/	5.00	

Course-Section: ART 315 1
Title Video I

Instructor: Grabill, Vincent

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 88 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5 5	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	1	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-	_		
				?	0						

University of

Intro To Printmaking

Instructor: Custen, Calvin R

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 12

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 89 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	Frequencies			Tngi	tructor	Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	2	0	_	1	0	1	-	4 56	E40/1E00	4 56	4 24	4 21	4 20	4 56
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	540/1509	4.56	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	•	U	0	0	3	5 2	4.63	401/1509	4.63	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	6 0	0	0	0 1	1 1	7	4.67 4.67	359/1287	4.67	4.39	4.30	4.33	4.67 4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	1	0	1	0	1		280/1459 1333/1406	4.67 3.00	4.32	4.22 4.09	4.26	3.00
-	3	6	0	1	0	0	2	4.00			3.81			4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	1	0	1	2	3		807/1384		3.67	4.11	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	T	1	8		1141/1489	3.86	3.97	4.17	4.14	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.89	622/1506 853/1463	4.89	4.60 4.12	4.67 4.09	4.67 4.08	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	U	Τ.	U	U	4	3	4.00	053/1403	4.00	4.12	4.09	4.00	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	712/1438	4.57	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	532/1411	4.57	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	228/1405	4.86	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1236	****	4.42	4.00	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	487/1260	4.43	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	390/1255	4.71	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	570/1258	4.57	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	4.11	4.03	4.08	4.00
T - 1 1														
Laboratory				•			_							****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11 11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 177 ****/ 165	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	U	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	****/ 105			4.18	4.11	* * * * *
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 89	****	4.88	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	4.94	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 90	****	4.85	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, -	****	4.46	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		****	4.25	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.75	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.67	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.33	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	4.00	4.14	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.UU ****	4.31	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
J. Were there enough proctors for all the students	тт	U	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	/ 30			1.4/	5.00	

Title Intro To Printmaking

Enrollment:

Instructor: Custen, Calvin R

12 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 89 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Type				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	5		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	7		
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0								
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough			
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant			
				I	0	Other	0	_					
				?	0								

Title 20Th Century Art Instructor: Fagan, Robert J.

Instructor: Faga
Enrollment: 51
Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 90 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions		NA	Fre	requencies		s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	
Questions														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	6	31	4.65	422/1509	4.54	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	33	4.80	201/1509	4.59	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	9	30	4.77	250/1287	4.72	4.39	4.30	4.33	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	1 1	4 2	7	20	4.44	569/1459	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0			14	23	4.47	366/1406	4.41	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1 0	0 1	2	7 2	7	23	4.31			3.67	4.11	4.15	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	3 12	34 26	4.72	216/1489 957/1506	4.38 4.61	3.97 4.60	$4.17 \\ 4.67$	4.14 4.67	4.72 4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	8	25	4.66			4.12	4.09	4.07	4.66
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	4	33	4.82	348/1438	4.85	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	2	35	4.87	639/1421	4.90	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	6	32	4.74			4.31	4.31	4.29	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	6	30	4.74	369/1405	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	0	3	31	4.91	60/1236			4.00	4.07	4.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	4	8	16	4.23	637/1260	4.24	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	4	4	20	4.48	593/1255	4.44	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.48
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	1	5	23	4.67	507/1258	4.73	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	10	23	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/ 873	3.79	4.11	4.03	4.08	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	1	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.88	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.94	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 90	****	4.85	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.46	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	***	4.35	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.25	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.75	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 47	****	4.67	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.33	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	4.00	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: ART 323 1 Title 20Th Century Art

Instructor: Fagan, Robert J.

Enrollment: 51
Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 90 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	34	Graduate	0	Major	32
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	40	Non-major	8
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-		_	
				?	2						

Course-Section: ART 323 2 Title 20Th Century Art Instructor: Jacob,Preminda

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 26

38

Fall 2009

University of Maryland Page 91 Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Ctudont	Courac	Erraluation	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnarie

			Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect				
	Questions	NR	N	ΙA	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	13	12	4.42	698/1509	4.54	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.42
2. Did the instructo	or make clear the expected goals	0		0	0	0	4	8	14	4.38	720/1509	4.59	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.38
3. Did the exam ques	stions reflect the expected goals	0		1	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	348/1287	4.72	4.39	4.30	4.33	4.68
4. Did other evaluat	tions reflect the expected goals	0		0	0	2	3	8	13	4.23	792/1459	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.23
5. Did assigned read	dings contribute to what you learned	0 E		0	1	1	1	8	15	4.35	494/1406	4.41	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.35
6. Did written assig	gnments contribute to what you lear	ned 1		2	0	4	4	3	12	4.00	807/1384	4.15	3.67	4.11	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading s	system clearly explained	0		0	0	4	3	7	12	4.04	965/1489	4.38	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.04
8. How many times wa	as class cancelled	0		0	0	0	0	11	15	4.58	1014/1506	4.61	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.58
9. How would you gra	ade the overall teaching effectiven	ess 5		1	0	0	1	12	7	4.30	579/1463	4.48	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.30
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruct	tor's lectures well prepared	1		0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	247/1438	4.85	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.88
2. Did the instructo	or seem interested in the subject	0		0	0	0	1	0	25	4.92	429/1421	4.90	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.92
3. Was lecture mater	rial presented and explained clearly	y 0		0	0	0	3	7	16	4.50	617/1411	4.62	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.50
4. Did the lectures	contribute to what you learned	0		0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	333/1405	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.77
5. Did audiovisual t	techniques enhance your understandi	ng 0		0	0	0	2	3	21	4.73	137/1236	4.82	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.73
	Discussion															
1. Did class discuss	sions contribute to what you learned	d 6		0	0	1	3	6	10	4.25	621/1260	4.24	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.25
	s actively encouraged to participate			0	1	0	3	2	14	4.40	665/1255	4.44	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.40
	or encourage fair and open discussion			0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	363/1258	4.73	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.80
4. Were special tech	nniques successful	6		1	1	4	2	3	9	3.79	595/ 873	3.79	4.11	4.03	4.08	3.79
	F	requenc	y D)ist	ribu	ıtior	ı									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected Gra	des				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe.			Majors	
											- 2 .	-			5	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	20	 Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	26	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				2	1						

Title History Of Film To 196

Instructor: Sturgeon, John

Enrollment: 61
Questionnaires: 57

Sturgeon, John Fall

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2009

Page 92 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructo: Rai	_	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	General																
	n new insights, skills from thi		21	0	1	2	8	10	15		1114/		4.00	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.00
	tructor make clear the expecte	-	21	0	2	3 0	8 9	11 9	12 15		1246/		3.78	4.23	4.26	4.25	3.78
	m questions reflect the expect	-	21 22	23	0	2	2	3			1010/		3.92	4.39	4.30	4.33	3.92 ****
	evaluations reflect the expected		21	23 0	0	0	4		5 19		****/						
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned					2	0	4	13 3	19	4.42			4.42 ****	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.42
	-	it you learned	21	24	2				-		****/			3.67	4.11	4.15	
_	ding system clearly explained		22	0		1	3	8	21	4.29	728/		4.29	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.29
	mes was class cancelled	offostirronoss	22 26	1 0	0 2	0 1	0 5	6 19	28 4	4.82	742/1 1142/1			4.60 4.12	4.67 4.09	4.67 4.08	4.82 3.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness			26	U	۷	1	5	19	4	3.71	1142/	1403	3./1	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.71
Lecture																	
1. Were the in	structor's lectures well prepa	ıred	23	0	0	0	1	7	26	4.74	480/	1438	4.74	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject			23	0	0	0	2	2	30	4.82	742/	1421	4.82	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly			23	0	0	0	5	15	14	4.26	876/	1411	4.26	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.26
4. Did the lec	tures contribute to what you l	.earned	23	0	0	1	8	12	13	4.09	1010/	1405	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.09
5. Did audiovi	sual techniques enhance your u	understanding	23	0	0	0	0	2	32	4.94	40/	1236	4.94	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.94
Discussion																	
1. Did class d	discussions contribute to what	you learned	40	0	6	3	3	2	3	2.59	1238/	1260	2.59	4.18	4.14	4.22	2.59
	2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate			0	5	2	6	0	2		1243/		2.47	4.41	4.33	4.37	2.47
	tructor encourage fair and ope		42 42	0	3	0	7	0	5		1197/		3.27	4.47	4.38	4.42	3.27
	l techniques successful		41	14	0	1	0	0	1		****/		****	4.11	4.03	4.08	****
	- 1																
2 Were vou pr	Laboratory ovided with adequate backgrour	nd information	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/	198	****	****	4 22	4.17	****
z. were you pr	ovided with adequate backgroun	ia illiormacion	50	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	1.00	,	100			1.22	1.1,	
	Seminar																
	ed topics relevant to the anno		54	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	,	89	****	4.88	4.49	4.86	***
	tructor available for individu		54	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	92	****	4.94	4.54	4.67	***
4. Did present	ations contribute to what you	learned	54	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	92	****	4.46	4.38	4.73	****
	Field Work																
1. Did field e	experience contribute to what y	ou learned	54	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/	48	****	4.75	4.39	4.61	****
	arly understand your evaluation		54	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00		48	****	4.25	4.41	4.34	****
-	tructor available for consulta		54	2	0	0	0	1	0		****/	47	****	4.75		4.62	****
	Self Paced		- 4			_	_		_			4.0					
_	ced system contribute to what questions make clear the expect	-	54 54	0 2	0	0	1	2	0		****/ ****/	49 41	****	3.67 ***	4.26 4.14	5.00 5.00	****
z. Dia study q	descions make clear the expect	ed goal	34	۷	U	U	Т	U	U	3.00	,	41			4.14	5.00	
		Frequ	iency	Dis	tribu	utio	n										
Credita Farned	mested Grades				Po:	ason	c				Туј	26			Majors		
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades																	
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 1 A 12					quire	ed f	or M	ajor	s 1	.8	Grad	duate	е	0	Majo	or	14
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 9																	
56-83 4 2.00-2.99 0 C 6				Gei	neral	1				6	Und	er-g	rad 5	57	Non-	major	43
84-150 6 3.00-3.49 6 D 0										7				.1			1-
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				7			Means t			_	n
P 0				0.1					_			ponse	es to b	e sign	uiicar	ıt	
I 0 Other						0											

4

Course-Section: ART 331 1 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title Graph Des I: Image, Si

Instructor: Abraham, Guenet Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 22

Fall 2009

Page 93 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionn	aire
---------	--------	------------	-----------	------

			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	3	0	1	0	4	7	7	4.00	1114/1509	3.84	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	3	5	9	2	3.53	1363/1509	3.48	4.23	4.26	4.25	3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	15	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1287	2.75	4.39	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	1	0	4	6	7	4.00	979/1459	3.91	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	12	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	813/1406	4.00	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	16	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1384	****	3.67	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	3	4	7	3	1	2.72	1441/1489	2.72	3.97	4.17	4.14	2.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	1098/1506	4.33	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	8	5	4	3.76	1092/1463	3.63	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	1	4	9	3	3.67	1343/1438	3.71	4.38	4.46	4.43	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	0	18		691/1421	4.67	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	4	3	8	3		1266/1411	3.53	4.31	4.31	4.29	3.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	3	6	6	3.78	1185/1405	3.76	4.31	4.32	4.32	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	2	3	5	6	3.61	930/1236	3.49	4.42	4.00	4.07	3.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	Λ	4	3	5	4.08	718/1260	4.04	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	443/1255	4.48	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	770/1258	4.22	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	10	9	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 873	2.80	4.11	4.03	4.08	****
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •														

Credits E	Credits Earned Cur			Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	 5	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ART 331 2 University of Maryland Title Graph Des I: Image, Si

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 94

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 16 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

I ?

0

Instructor:

Abraham, Guenet

		Ouestion	_		NID	3.7.7	Fre	_	ncies	5 4	_		ructor	Course	_	UMBC Mean	Level	
		Question	s 		NK	NA			3 	- 4 	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	mean	Mean	mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	ı qain ne	w insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	1	2	5	1	7	3.69	1330/1509	3.84	4.34	4.31	4.32	3.69
_	_	tor make clear			0	0	2	1	6	2	5	3.44	1394/1509	3.48	4.23	4.26	4.25	3.44
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	12	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	1279/1287	2.75	4.39	4.30	4.33	2.75
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	2	1	2	4	7	3.81	1159/1459	3.91	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.81
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	14	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1406	4.00	3.81	4.09	4.12	****
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	14	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1384	****	3.67	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	1	1	3	4	3	2	2	2.71	1442/1489	2.72	3.97	4.17	4.14	2.71
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	1	0	0	9	6	4.19	1305/1506	4.33	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.19
9. How wor	ıld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	1	3	4	0	6	3.50	1241/1463	3.63	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.50
	Lecture																	
			4															
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	1	2	2	1			1315/1438			4.46	4.43	3.75
		instructor seem interested in the subject					0	1	1	1			1162/1421	4.67	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.50
				xplained clearly	4	0	3	0	2	2			1277/1411	3.53	4.31	4.31	4.29	3.50
		s contribute t		-	4	0	1	1	2	4			1191/1405	3.76	4.31		4.32	
5. Did aud	diovisual	. techniques en	hance y	our understanding	4	4	2	0	1	3	2	3.38	1042/1236	3.49	4.42	4.00	4.07	3.38
		D																
1 544 -1-		Discus			_	0	1	1	0	2	_	4 00	746/1060	4 04	4 10	1 11	4 00	4 00
				what you learned d to participate	6	0	1	1	0 2	0	5	4.00	. ,	4.04		4.14	4.22	4.00 4.30
				d to participate d open discussion	6 6	0	0	2	1	1		4.30		4.48 4.22	4.41	4.33	4.37	
		chniques succe		a open arscussion	6	5	1	1	1	2	0		842/ 873			4.03	4.42	
4. Were sp	peciai te	ciniiques succe	SSLUI		0	5	Τ	1	1	2	U	2.00	042/ 0/3	2.00	4.11	4.03	4.00	2.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	1
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A б		Red	 guire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors		.4	Graduat	 e	0	Majo		14
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В 8			-									3 -		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									_				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	it	

Other

0

Course-Section: ART 332 1 University of Maryland

Title Design & Tech I: Print Baltimore County Instructor: Cordova, Viviana Fall 2009

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 95

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	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 gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	3	2	8	2	3.60	1369/1509	4.14	4.34	4.31	4.32	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	4	5	4	2	3.27	1432/1509	3.91	4.23	4.26	4.25	3.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	4	5	3	3.64	1249/1459	4.18	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	5	5	1	3.21	1295/1406	3.56	3.81	4.09	4.12	3.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	3	3	2	3	1	2.67	1366/1384	2.79	3.67	4.11	4.15	2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	3	5	1	2	2	2.62	1457/1489	3.59	3.97	4.17	4.14	2.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	2	4.13	1330/1506	4.40	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	2	9	0	0	2.67	1434/1463	3.74	4.12	4.09	4.08	2.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	5	5	1	3.31	1391/1438	4.10	4.38	4.46	4.43	3.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	1282/1421	4.65	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	5	3	2	3.14	1348/1411	3.94	4.31	4.31	4.29	3.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	3	6	1	1	2.83	1373/1405	3.98	4.31	4.32	4.32	2.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	752/1236	4.28	4.42	4.00	4.07	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	3	4	3	3 46	1063/1260	4.08	4.18	4.14	4.22	3.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	3	2	6		1050/1255	4.29	4.41	4.33	4.37	3.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	2	1	1	8	4.00	932/1258	4.43	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	2	1	2	0	0	2.00	866/ 873	3.39	4.11	4.03	4.08	2.00
1	_	•	_	_	_	•	•		2227 075				00	

Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	Ο						

Course-Section: ART 332 2

Title Design & Tech I: Print

Instructor: Cordova, Viviana

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 96 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 2 3 0 4 8 3.76 1301/1509 4.14 4.34 4.31 4.32 3.76 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 13 0 0 1 1 2 4.7 3 3.53 1363/1509 3.91 4.23 4.26 4.25 3.53 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 13 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 ****/1287 ***** 4.39 4.30 4.33 ***** 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 1 0 1 3 6 6 4.06 938/1459 4.18 4.32 4.22 4.26 4.06 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 2 4 4 0 6 3.25 1283/1406 3.56 3.81 4.09 4.12 3.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 2 3 4 2 2 2.92 1339/1384 2.79 3.67 4.11 4.15 2.92 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 5 2 8 2 3.41 1339/1489 3.59 3.97 4.17 4.14 3.41 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 6 4.35 1194/1506 4.00 4.60 4.67 4.35 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 2 2 5 3 3.54 1230/1463 3.74 4.12 4.09 4.08 3.54 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 2 4 4 5 3.80 1297/1438 4.10 4.38 4.46 4.43 3.80 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 1 1 3 1 4.50 1162/1421 4.65 4.77 4.73 4.73 4.50 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 2 1 7 4 3.73 1211/1411 3.94 4.31 4.31 4.29 3.73 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 2 2 5 6 6 4.00 664/1236 4.08 4.18 4.14 4.22 4.00 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 2 5 6 4.31 792/1258 4.43 4.47 4.38 4.42 4.01 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 2 5 6 4.31 792/1258 4.43 4.47 4.38 4.42 4.31 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 2 5 6 6 4.31 792/1258 4.43 4.47 4.38 4.42 4.31 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.94 4.54 4.67 **** 2. Was the instructor excellation and open discussion 4 7 0 1 2 1 2 5.00 ***/ 92 **** 4.94 4.54 4.67 ****	Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	es 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 2 3 0 0 4 8 3.76 1301/1509 4.14 4.34 4.31 4.32 3.76 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 1 1 2 4 7 3 3.53 1363/1509 3.91 4.23 4.26 4.25 3.53 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 1 2 4.25 ****/1287 **** 4.39 4.30 4.33 **** 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 1 3 6 6 4.06 938/1459 4.18 4.32 4.22 4.26 4.06 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 2 4 4 0 6 3.25 1283/1406 3.56 3.81 4.09 4.12 3.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4 2 3 4 2 2 2.92 1339/1384 2.79 3.67 4.11 4.15 2.92 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 6 4.35 1194/1506 4.40 4.60 4.67 4.67 4.67 4.55 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 2 2 5 3 3.54 1230/1463 3.74 4.12 4.09 4.08 3.54 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 2 4 4 5 3.80 1297/1438 4.10 4.38 4.46 4.43 3.80 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 1 1 3 1 4.50 1162/1421 4.65 4.77 4.73 4.73 4.50 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 1 2 1 7 4 3.73 1211/1411 3.94 4.31 4.31 4.32 4.32 4.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 2 2 2 6 6 4.00 664/1236 4.28 4.42 4.00 4.07 4.00 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 2 4 7 4.88 681/1255 4.29 4.41 4.33 4.37 4.88 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 2 4 7 4.88 681/1255 4.29 4.41 4.33 4.37 4.88 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 2 5 6 4.31 792/1258 4.43 4.47 4.38 4.42 4.31 4.31 4.31 4.31 4.31 4.31 4.31 4.31															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 1 2 4 7 7 3 3.53 1363/1509 3.91 4.23 4.26 4.25 3.53 3.51 did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 13 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 ****/1287 **** 4.39 4.30 4.33 **** 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 1 3 6 6 4.06 938/1459 4.18 4.32 4.22 4.25 4.06 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 2 4 4 0 6 3.25 1283/1406 3.56 3.81 4.09 4.12 3.25 6. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 2 4 4 0 6 3.25 1283/1406 3.56 3.81 4.09 4.12 3.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 5 2 8 2 3.41 1339/1489 3.59 3.97 4.17 4.14 3.41 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 6 4.35 1194/1506 4.40 4.60 4.67 4.67 4.55 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 2 2 5 3 3.54 1230/1463 3.74 4.12 4.09 4.08 3.54 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 2 4 4 5 3.80 1297/1438 4.10 4.38 4.46 4.43 3.80 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 1 1 3 1 4.50 1162/1421 4.65 4.77 4.73 4.73 4.50 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 1 2 1 7 4 3.73 1211/411 3.94 4.31 4.31 4.31 4.99 3.73 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 2 5 7 4.00 1047/1405 3.98 4.31 4.32 4.32 4.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 2 2 6 6 4.00 664/1236 4.28 4.42 4.00 4.07 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 1 3 4 5 4.00 746/1260 4.08 4.18 4.14 4.22 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 2 4 7 4.38 681/1255 4.29 4.41 4.33 4.37 4.38 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 2 5 6 4.31 792/1258 4.43 4.47 4.38 4.42 4.31 4. Were special techniques successful 4 7 0 1 2 1 2 1 2 3.67 650/873 3.39 4.11 4.03 4.08 3.67 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.94 4.54 4.57 ***** 3. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0	General														
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 13 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 ****/1287 **** 4.39 4.30 4.33 **** 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 1 3 6 6 4.06 938/1459 4.18 4.32 4.22 4.26 4.06 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 2 4 4 0 6 3.25 1283/1406 3.56 3.81 4.09 4.12 3.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4 2 3 4 2 2 2.92 1339/1384 2.79 3.67 4.11 4.15 2.92 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 5 2 8 2 3.41 1339/1489 3.59 3.97 4.17 4.14 3.41 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 11 6 4.35 1194/1506 4.40 4.60 4.67 4.67 4.35 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 2 2 5 3 3.54 1230/1463 3.74 4.12 4.09 4.08 3.54 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 2 4 4 5 3.80 1297/1438 4.10 4.38 4.46 4.43 3.80 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 1 1 1 3 11 4.50 1162/1421 4.65 4.77 4.73 4.73 4.50 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 1 2 1 7 4 3.73 1211/1411 3.94 4.31 4.31 4.29 3.73 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 2 5 7 4.00 1047/1405 3.98 4.31 4.32 4.32 4.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 2 2 6 6 4.00 664/1236 4.28 4.42 4.00 4.07 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 3 4 5 4.00 746/1260 4.08 4.18 4.14 4.22 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 2 2 6 6 4.00 664/1236 4.28 4.42 4.00 4.07 4.38 4. Were special techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 2 2 5 6 6 4.31 792/1258 4.43 4.47 4.38 4.47 4.38 5. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 7 0 1 2 1 2 3.67 650/873 3.39 4.11 4.03 4.08 3.67 Seminar 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.94 4.54 4.67 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.95 4.50 4.63 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 **	1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	0	4	8	3.76	1301/1509	4.14	4.34	4.31	4.32	3.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 1 3 6 6 4.06 938/1459 4.18 4.32 4.22 4.26 4.06 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 2 4 4 0 6 3.25 1283/1406 3.56 3.81 4.09 4.12 3.25 6. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 4 2 3 4 2 2.92 1339/1384 2.79 3.67 4.11 4.15 2.92 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 5 2 8 2 3.41 1339/1489 3.59 3.97 4.17 4.14 3.41 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 6 4.35 1194/1506 4.40 4.60 4.67 4.67 4.35 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 2 2 5 3 3.54 1230/1463 3.74 4.12 4.09 4.08 3.54 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 2 4 4 5 3.80 1297/1438 4.10 4.38 4.46 4.43 3.80 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 1 1 3 11 4.50 1162/1421 4.65 4.77 4.73 4.73 4.50 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 1 2 1 7 4 3.73 1211/1411 3.94 4.31 4.29 3.73 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 1 2 5 7 4.00 1047/1405 3.98 4.31 4.32 4.32 4.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 2 2 6 6 4.00 664/1236 4.28 4.42 4.00 4.07 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 1 3 4 5 4.00 746/1260 4.08 4.18 4.14 4.22 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 2 2 6 6 4.00 664/1236 4.28 4.42 4.00 4.07 4.00 Discussion 2. Were special techniques successful 4 7 0 1 2 1 2 3.67 650/873 3.39 4.11 4.03 4.08 3.67 Seminar 2. Was the instructor evaliable for individual attention 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.94 4.54 4.67 **** 4.00 did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.46 4.38 4.73 **** 4.00 did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.46 4.38 4.73 **** 4.00 did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.46 4.38 4.73 ****	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	7	3	3.53	1363/1509	3.91	4.23	4.26	4.25	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 2 4 4 0 6 3.25 1283/1406 3.56 3.81 4.09 4.12 3.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4 2 3 4 2 2 2.92 1339/1384 2.79 3.67 4.11 4.15 2.92 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 5 2 8 2 3.41 1339/1489 3.59 3.97 4.17 4.14 3.41 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 11 6 4.35 1194/1506 4.40 4.60 4.67 4.67 4.35 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 2 2 5 3 3.54 1230/1463 3.74 4.12 4.09 4.08 3.54 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 0 2 4 4 5 3.80 1297/1438 4.10 4.38 4.46 4.43 3.80 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 1 1 3 11 4.50 1162/1421 4.65 4.77 4.73 4.73 4.50 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 1 2 1 7 4 3.73 1211/1411 3.94 4.31 4.31 4.29 3.73 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 2 5 7 4.00 1047/1405 3.98 4.31 4.32 4.32 4.32 4.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 2 2 6 6 4.00 664/1236 4.28 4.42 4.00 4.07 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 1 3 4 5 4.00 746/1260 4.08 4.18 4.14 4.22 4.00 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 2 4 7 4.38 681/1255 4.29 4.41 4.33 4.37 4.38 Were special techniques successful 4 7 0 1 2 1 2 3.67 650/873 3.39 4.11 4.03 4.08 3.67 Seminar 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.94 4.54 4.67 **** 4.01 dresearch projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.94 4.54 4.67 **** 4.01 dresearch projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 **** 4.01 dresearch projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.86 4.38 4.73 **** 4.84 4.04 4.04 4.04 4.04 4.04 4.04 4.05 **** 4.04 4.04 4.05 4.08 4.06 4.07 **** 4.04 4.05 4.08 4.06 4.07 **** 4.05 4.06 4.07 **** 4.05 4.06 4.07 **** 4.05 4.06 4.07 **** 4.05 4.06 4.07 **** 4	3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.33	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4 2 3 4 2 2 2.92 1339/1384 2.79 3.67 4.11 4.15 2.92 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 5 5 2 8 2 3.41 1339/1489 3.59 3.97 4.17 4.14 3.41 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 11 6 4.35 1194/1506 4.04 4.60 4.67 4.67 4.35 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 2 2 5 3 3.54 1230/1463 3.74 4.12 4.09 4.08 3.54	4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	938/1459	4.18	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 5 2 8 2 3.41 1339/1489 3.59 3.97 4.17 4.14 3.41 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 11 6 4.35 1194/1506 4.40 4.60 4.67 4.67 4.35 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 2 2 5 3 3.54 1230/1463 3.74 4.12 4.09 4.08 3.54 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 2 4 4 5 3.80 1297/1438 4.10 4.38 4.46 4.43 3.80 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 1 1 3 11 4.50 1162/1421 4.65 4.77 4.73 4.73 4.50 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 1 2 1 7 4 3.73 1211/1411 3.94 4.31 4.31 4.29 3.73 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 2 5 7 4.00 1047/1405 3.98 4.31 4.32 4.32 4.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 2 2 6 6 4.00 664/1236 4.28 4.42 4.00 4.07 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 1 2 1 2 1 2 3.67 650/873 3.39 4.11 4.33 4.37 4.38 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 2 2 5 6 4.31 792/1258 4.43 4.47 4.38 4.42 4.31 4. Were special techniques successful 4 7 0 1 2 1 2 3.67 650/873 3.39 4.11 4.03 4.08 3.67 Seminar 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.94 4.54 4.67 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 ***** 4.85 bid research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.46 4.58 4.73 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 ***** 4.85 bid presentations contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.46 4.58 4.73 ****	5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	_	4	4	0	6	3.25	1283/1406	3.56	3.81	4.09	4.12	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 11 6 4.35 1194/1506 4.40 4.60 4.67 4.67 4.35 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 2 2 5 3 3.54 1230/1463 3.74 4.12 4.09 4.08 3.54 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 2 4 4 5 3.80 1297/1438 4.10 4.38 4.46 4.43 3.80 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 1 1 3 11 4.50 1162/1421 4.65 4.77 4.73 4.73 4.50 3.80 120 114 11 3.94 4.31 4.31 4.29 3.73 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 2 5 7 4.00 1047/1405 3.98 4.31 4.32 4.32 4.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 2 2 6 6 4.00 664/1236 4.28 4.42 4.00 4.07 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 3 4 5 4.00 746/1260 4.08 4.18 4.14 4.22 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 2 4 7 4.38 681/1255 4.29 4.41 4.33 4.37 4.38 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 2 5 6 4.31 792/1258 4.43 4.47 4.38 4.42 4.31 4. Were special techniques successful 4 7 0 1 2 1 2 3.67 650/ 873 3.39 4.11 4.03 4.08 3.67 Seminar 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.94 4.54 4.67 **** 4.00 did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.94 4.54 4.67 **** 4.00 did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 **** 4.00 did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 **** 4.00 did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 **** 4.00 did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 **	6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	_		-	2	2	2.92	1339/1384	2.79	3.67	4.11	4.15	2.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 2 2 5 3 3.54 1230/1463 3.74 4.12 4.09 4.08 3.54 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 2 4 4 5 3.80 1297/1438 4.10 4.38 4.46 4.43 3.80 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 1 1 3 11 4.50 1162/1421 4.65 4.77 4.73 4.73 4.50 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 1 2 1 7 4 3.73 1211/1411 3.94 4.31 4.31 4.29 3.73 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 2 5 7 4.00 1047/1405 3.98 4.31 4.32 4.32 4.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 2 2 6 6 4.00 664/1236 4.28 4.42 4.00 4.07 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 1 3 4 5 4.00 746/1260 4.08 4.18 4.14 4.22 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 2 2 4 7 4.38 681/1255 4.29 4.41 4.33 4.37 4.38 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 2 5 6 4.31 792/1258 4.43 4.47 4.38 4.42 4.31 4. Were special techniques successful 4 7 0 1 2 1 2 3.67 650/873 3.39 4.11 4.03 4.08 3.67 Seminar 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.94 4.54 4.67 **** 4.91 dresearch projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.94 4.54 4.67 **** 4.91 dresearch projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.46 4.38 4.73 **** 4.91 dresearch projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.46 4.38 4.73 ****	7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	•	-	2	8	2	3.41	1339/1489	3.59	3.97	4.17	4.14	3.41
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 2 4 4 5 3.80 1297/1438 4.10 4.38 4.46 4.43 3.80 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Discussion 7. Discussion 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Did the instructor encouraged to participate 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Vere all students actively encouraged to participate 9. Were special techniques successful 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Seminar 9. Was the instructor available for individual attention 9. Seminar 9. Was the instructor available for individual attention 9. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 9. Did presentations contribute to what you le		0	0	0	-	-	11	6	4.35	1194/1506	4.40	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.35
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 2 4 4 5 3.80 1297/1438 4.10 4.38 4.46 4.43 3.80 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 1 1 3 11 4.50 1162/1421 4.65 4.77 4.73 4.73 4.50 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 1 2 1 7 4 3.73 1211/1411 3.94 4.31 4.31 4.29 3.73 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 2 5 7 4.00 1047/1405 3.98 4.31 4.32 4.32 4.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 2 2 6 6 4.00 664/1236 4.28 4.42 4.00 4.07 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 3 4 5 4.00 746/1260 4.08 4.18 4.14 4.22 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 2 2 4 7 4.38 681/1255 4.29 4.41 4.33 4.37 4.38 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 2 5 6 4.31 792/1258 4.43 4.47 4.38 4.42 4.31 4. Were special techniques successful 4 7 0 1 2 1 2 3.67 650/873 3.39 4.11 4.03 4.08 3.67 Seminar 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.94 4.54 4.67 **** 4.91 degree for individual attention 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.46 4.38 4.73 **** 4.91 degree for individual earned 16 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.46 4.38 4.73 ****	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	2	2	5	3	3.54	1230/1463	3.74	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 1 1 3 11 4.50 1162/1421 4.65 4.77 4.73 4.73 4.50 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 1 2 1 7 4 3.73 1211/1411 3.94 4.31 4.31 4.29 3.73 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 2 5 7 4.00 1047/1405 3.98 4.31 4.32 4.32 4.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 2 2 6 6 4.00 664/1236 4.28 4.42 4.00 4.07 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 3 4 5 4.00 746/1260 4.08 4.18 4.14 4.22 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 2 4 7 4.38 681/1255 4.29 4.41 4.33 4.37 4.38 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 2 5 6 4.31 792/1258 4.43 4.47 4.38 4.42 4.31 4. Were special techniques successful 4 7 0 1 2 1 2 3.67 650/873 3.39 4.11 4.03 4.08 3.67 Seminar 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.94 4.54 4.67 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.46 4.38 4.73 ****	Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 1 1 3 11 4.50 1162/1421 4.65 4.77 4.73 4.73 4.50 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 1 2 1 7 4 3.73 1211/1411 3.94 4.31 4.31 4.29 3.73 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 2 5 7 4.00 1047/1405 3.98 4.31 4.32 4.32 4.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 2 2 6 6 4.00 664/1236 4.28 4.42 4.00 4.07 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 3 4 5 4.00 746/1260 4.08 4.18 4.14 4.22 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 2 4 7 4.38 681/1255 4.29 4.41 4.33 4.37 4.38 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 2 5 6 4.31 792/1258 4.43 4.47 4.38 4.42 4.31 4. Were special techniques successful 4 7 0 1 2 1 2 3.67 650/873 3.39 4.11 4.03 4.08 3.67 Seminar 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.94 4.54 4.67 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.86 4.38 4.73 ****	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	4	4	5	3.80	1297/1438	4.10	4.38	4.46	4.43	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 2 5 7 4.00 1047/1405 3.98 4.31 4.32 4.32 4.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 2 2 6 6 4.00 664/1236 4.28 4.42 4.00 4.07 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 3 4 5 4.00 746/1260 4.08 4.18 4.14 4.22 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 2 4 7 4.38 681/1255 4.29 4.41 4.33 4.37 4.38 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 2 5 6 4.31 792/1258 4.43 4.47 4.38 4.42 4.31 4. Were special techniques successful 4 7 0 1 2 1 2 3.67 650/873 3.39 4.11 4.03 4.08 3.67 Seminar 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.94 4.54 4.67 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.46 4.38 4.73 ****	± ±	1	0	0	1	1	3	11						4.73	4.50
Discussion 1 0 0 2 2 6 6 4.00 664/1236 4.28 4.42 4.00 4.07 4.00 Discussion 1 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 3 4 5 4.00 746/1260 4.08 4.18 4.14 4.22 4.00 2 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 2 4 7 4.38 681/1255 4.29 4.41 4.33 4.37 4.38 3 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 2 5 6 4.31 792/1258 4.43 4.47 4.38 4.42 4.31 4 Were special techniques successful 4 7 0 1 2 1 2 3.67 650/873 3.39 4.11 4.03 4.08 3.67 Seminar 2 Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.94 4.54 4.67 **** 3 Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 **** 4 Did presentations contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.46 4.38 4.73 ****	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	1	7	4	3.73	1211/1411	3.94	4.31	4.31	4.29	3.73
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 3 4 5 4.00 746/1260 4.08 4.18 4.14 4.22 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 2 4 7 4.38 681/1255 4.29 4.41 4.33 4.37 4.38 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 2 5 6 4.31 792/1258 4.43 4.47 4.38 4.42 4.31 4. Were special techniques successful 4 7 0 1 2 1 2 3.67 650/873 3.39 4.11 4.03 4.08 3.67 Seminar 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.94 4.54 4.67 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.46 4.38 4.73 ****		1	0	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	1047/1405	3.98	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 3 4 5 4.00 746/1260 4.08 4.18 4.14 4.22 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 2 4 7 4.38 681/1255 4.29 4.41 4.33 4.37 4.38 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 2 5 6 4.31 792/1258 4.43 4.47 4.38 4.42 4.31 4. Were special techniques successful 4 7 0 1 2 1 2 3.67 650/873 3.39 4.11 4.03 4.08 3.67 Seminar 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.94 4.54 4.67 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.46 4.38 4.73 ****	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	2	6	6	4.00	664/1236	4.28	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 3 4 5 4.00 746/1260 4.08 4.18 4.14 4.22 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 2 4 7 4.38 681/1255 4.29 4.41 4.33 4.37 4.38 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 2 5 6 4.31 792/1258 4.43 4.47 4.38 4.42 4.31 4. Were special techniques successful 4 7 0 1 2 1 2 3.67 650/873 3.39 4.11 4.03 4.08 3.67 Seminar 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.94 4.54 4.67 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.46 4.38 4.73 ****	Discussion														
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 2 4 7 4.38 681/1255 4.29 4.41 4.33 4.37 4.38 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 2 5 6 4.31 792/1258 4.43 4.47 4.38 4.42 4.31 4. Were special techniques successful 4 7 0 1 2 1 2 3.67 650/873 3.39 4.11 4.03 4.08 3.67 Seminar 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.94 4.54 4.67 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.46 4.38 4.73 ****		4	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	746/1260	4.08	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 2 5 6 4.31 792/1258 4.43 4.47 4.38 4.42 4.31 4. Were special techniques successful 4 7 0 1 2 1 2 3.67 650/873 3.39 4.11 4.03 4.08 3.67 Seminar 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.94 4.54 4.67 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 90 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.46 4.38 4.73 ****	-		0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	.,				4.37	4.38
4 7 0 1 2 1 2 3.67 650/873 3.39 4.11 4.03 4.08 3.67 Seminar 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.94 4.54 4.67 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 90 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.46 4.38 4.73 ****			0	0	0	2	5	6		,					
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.94 4.54 4.67 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 90 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.46 4.38 4.73 ****			7	0	1	2	1	2							
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.94 4.54 4.67 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 90 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.46 4.38 4.73 ****	Cominar														
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 90 **** 4.85 4.50 4.63 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.46 4.38 4.73 ****		16	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 02	****	1 0 1	1 = 1	1 67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.46 4.38 4.73 ****			-	•	-	•	0	1	5.00	, , , ,					
			-	-	-	_	-	1		,					
5. Weie Criteria for grading made Crear 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 """"/ 95 """" 4.55 4.06 5.94 """"			-		-	-	0	1		,					
	5. Were criteria for grauing made crear	10	U	U	U	U	U		5.00	/ 93		1.33	1.00	3.24	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-		-	
				_	4						

Course-Section: ART 332 3 University of Maryland Title

Design & Tech I: Print Baltimore County Rosenberg, Ari Fall 2009

Instructor: Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 97

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

	Questions			NR	NA	Fro	_	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		_		Level Mean		
			- 															
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	551/1509	4.14	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.55
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	838/1509	3.91	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.27
3. Did the	e exam qı	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did oth	her evalı	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	770/1459	4.18	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.25
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	3	1	0	4	0	3	3.50	1178/1406	3.56	3.81	4.09	4.12	3.50
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1384	2.79	3.67	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	986/1489	3.59	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	941/1506	4.40	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.67
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	690/1463	3.74	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.20
	Lecture																	
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	930/1438	4.10	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.40
					1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	537/1421	4.65	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.91
3. Was led	id the instructor seem interested in the subject as lecture material presented and explained clear]				1	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	1005/1411	3.94	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.09
					2	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	940/1405	3.98	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.20
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	314/1236	4.28	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.45
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	701/1260	4.08	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.13
				d to participate	5	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	851/1255	4.29	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.14
				d open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	700/1258	4.43	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.43
		echniques succe		a open arroadston	4	7	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 873		4.11	4.03	4.08	****
				Frequ	encs	, Die	tri b	ıt i o	n									
				rrequ	iency	DIS	CIID	ucio.	.1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	 s	9	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 5														
56-83	6-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	-major	2
84-150	4-150 2 3.00-3.49 2 D 0																	
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0					Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
	Р 0												respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
		I 0				Otl	her					0			_			
				? 1														

Course-Section: ART 332 4

University of Maryland

Design & Tech I: Print Baltimore County

Title Instructor: Rosenberg,Ari

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 10

Page 98 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque:	ncie	s 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	1	1	7	4.67	410/1509	4.14	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	483/1509	3.91	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	191/1459	4.18	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	551/1406	3.56	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	2.79	3.67	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	674/1489	3.59	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1127/1506	4.40	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	271/1463	3.74	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.57
Lecture														
 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	247/1438		4.38	4.46	4.43	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	588/1421		4.77	4.73	4.73	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2		4.78	279/1411			4.31	4.29	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	194/1405		4.31	4.32	4.32	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	126/1236	4.28	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.75
Discussion						_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	244/1260		4.18	4.14	4.22	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	229/1255		4.41	4.33	4.37	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1258		4.47	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	209/ 873	3.39	4.11	4.03	4.08	4.50
Laboratory	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	F 00	**** / 104	ate ate ate ate	4.4.4.4	4 16	4 05	
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184		****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198		****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 89	****	4.88	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92		4.94	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90		4.85	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92		4.46	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.25	4.41	4.34	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 47	****	4.75	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.67	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.33	4.32	4.40	***
Self Paced				•			_				0 65	4 0 6	- 00	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.00	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9 9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37 ****/ 30		****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students		0		0	0	U	1	5.00	****/ 30			4.2/	5.00	
		sity		_								3.4	Page	
Title Design & Tech I: Print Instructor: Rosenberg, Ari		imor all	e Coi	_									IAR 22, ob IRB	
Instructor. Rosenberg, Ari	r	атт	∠∪(υÞ								J	OD TKB	11.3023

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 10

Credits	redits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Frequencies

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean

Instructor

Rank

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean

Course-Section: ART 333 2 University of Maryland Page 99 MAR 22, 2010 Title Typography I Instructor: Campbell,Susan Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	11		
Questionnaires:	11	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Questions

		Quescion	D		1410	1477	_		J	-	5	rican	Raine	rican	rican	rican	rican	rican
		Genera																
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.34	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.23	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.32	4.22	4.26	5.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	306/1406	4.55	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.55
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	4	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	299/1384	4.57	3.67	4.11	4.15	4.57
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	216/1489	4.73	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.73
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	1243/1506	4.27	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.27
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	628/1463	4.25	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.25
1. Were th	he instri	Lectur uctor's lecture	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.38	4.46	4.43	5.00	
		n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11		1/1421	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.73			
				explained clearly	0	0	-	0	-	-	11			5.00	4.31			5.00
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	0	11		1/1405	5.00			4.32	
				your understanding	1	4	1	0	1	0		4.00						
		-	-	3														
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	172/1260	4.86	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.86
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	246/1255	4.86	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.86
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.47	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	_	4	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.11	4.03	4.08	5.00
				Frequ	ien <i>c</i> s	, Die	trib	ntio	n									
				11040	20110	DID	CIID	acro.										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	S			Typ	e			Majors	3
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 1 A 8						Re	 quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	9	Graduate	:	0	Majo	r)r	11
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1							-			-						3 -		
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 1 C 0						Ge	nera	1				0	Under-gr	ad 1	.1	Non-	major	0
84-150 4 3.00-3.49 1 D 0													3				-	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						El	ecti	ves				0	#### - Means there				e are not enough	
	Grad. 0 5.50-4.00 5 F 0												response	s to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
										-								

Other

0

0

0

. .

Course-Section: ART 334 1 University of Mar Title Graphic Design IV Baltimore Cour Instructor: Bell, Kathryn L Fall 2009

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

16

University of Maryland Page 100
Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010
Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fro	equei 2	ncie 3	s 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	2		0	0	0	4	10		351/1509			4.31	4.32	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	300/1509	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	86/1459	4.05	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned		13	0	0	0	0	1		****/1406		3.81	4.09	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		11	2	0	0	1	0		****/1384		3.67	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	,	4.03	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	11	3		1287/1506		4.60	4.67		4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	118/1463	3.98	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	348/1438	3.74	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1421	4.57	4.77	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	339/1411	3.95	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	596/1405		4.31		4.32	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	474/1236					4.27
	_	-	-		-	_	_		,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	136/1260	4.03	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1255	4.07	4.41	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	350/1258	4.05	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	209/ 873	4.50	4.11	4.03	4.08	4.50
Freq	10000	. D: a	+ mib		_									
rieq	uency	DIS	CLID	ucio	11									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 8		Re	quir	ed fo	or M	aior	s 1	4	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	 or	14
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 5			1			5	_	_		_	-	5	-	
56-83 4 2.00-2.99 1 C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	2
84-150 4 3.00-3.49 2 D 0								-	3		-		5	_
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0		El	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enou	_f h
P 0		_							respons				_	•
I O		Ot	her					0			5			
? 1														

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2009

Course-Section: ART 334 2 Title Graphic Design IV Coates, Joseph M Instructor:

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 15

Page 101 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	2	0	3	3	2	3.30	1440/1509	4.01	4.34	4.31	4.32	3.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1228/1509	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.25	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	5	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1058/1287	3.83	4.39	4.30	4.33	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	3	1	5	1	3.18	1399/1459	4.05	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	6	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	813/1406	4.00	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	4	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1107/1384	3.67	3.67	4.11	4.15	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	1263/1489	4.03	3.97	4.17	4.14	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1448/1506	4.06	4.60	4.67	4.67	3.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1364/1463	3.98	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	1425/1438	3.74	4.38	4.46	4.43	2.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	1322/1421	4.57	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.14
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1346/1411	3.95	4.31	4.31	4.29	3.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	1348/1405	3.77	4.31	4.32	4.32	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1236	4.27	4.42	4.00	4.07	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	1	3	1	3.14	1142/1260	4.03	4.18	4.14	4.22	3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	2	0	1	3	1	3.14	1195/1255	4.07	4.41	4.33	4.37	3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1193/1258	4.05	4.47	4.38	4.42	3.29
4. Were special techniques successful		4	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 873	4.50	4.11	4.03	4.08	****

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

Course-Section: ART 335 1 University of Maryland Page 102 MAR 22, 2010 Graphic Design V Baltimore County Smalls, James Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Frequencies

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

responses to be significant

Enrollment:	37	
Questionnaires:	36	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Р 0

I

0

1

Title

Instructor:

				LTE	equei	TCTE!	5		TIIS	LIUCLOI	Course	: Dept	UMPC	телет	Sect			
	Questions						1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did vou	ı gain ne	w insights,skil	ls from	this course	9	0	0	1	3	9	14	4.33	800/1509	4.33	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.33
_	_	tor make clear			9	0	1	2	6	6	12		1117/1509	3.96	4.23	4.26	4.25	3.96
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the exp	pected goals	9	0	1	1	4	12	9	4.00	924/1287	4.00	4.39	4.30	4.33	4.00
4. Did oth	er evalu	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	9	1	2	2	5	9	8	3.73	1202/1459	3.73	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.73
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contribut	te to wl	nat you learned	9	1	2	0	3	11	10	4.04	790/1406	4.04	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.04
6. Did wri	tten ass	ignments contril	bute to	what you learned	9	0	3	4	7	7	6	3.33	1264/1384	3.33	3.67	4.11	4.15	3.33
7. Was the	grading	system clearly	explair	ned	9	0	3	3	4	9	8	3.59	1267/1489	3.59	3.97	4.17	4.14	3.59
8. How man	y times	was class cance	lled		9	0	0	0	3	15	9	4.22	1280/1506	4.22	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.22
9. How wou	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness						2	0	4	10	4	3.70	1142/1463	3.70	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.70
		<u>.</u> .																
11		Lecture		1	_	0	0	-	0	_	0.1	4 50	F21 /1 420	4 50	4 20	1 16	4 40	4 50
	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject							1	0	5	21		531/1438			4.46	4.43	4.70
				_	9	0	1 1	2	2 4	5	18 12		1217/1421 1035/1411	4.41	4.77 4.31	4.73	4.73	4.41
		erial presented s contribute to			-	0	1	1	3	8	13		,	4.19		4.31	4.29	4.04
			_	ur understanding	9 10	4	2	0	3 1	4	15		947/1405 392/1236		4.31	4.32	4.32	4.19
5. Did aud	IIOVISUAI	techniques enna	ance you	ir understanding	10	4	2	U	1	4	13	4.30	392/1230	4.30	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.30
		Discuss	ion															
1. Did cla	ss discu	ssions contribut		nat vou learned	20	0	4	1	3	4	4	3.19	1136/1260	3.19	4.18	4.14	4.22	3.19
		ts actively enco		-	20	0	2	2	4	5			1171/1255		4.41	4.33	4.37	3.31
		_	_	open discussion	20	0	3	1	5	2	5		1188/1258		4.47	4.38	4.42	3.31
4. Were sp	ecial te	chniques success	sful	-	20	13	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 873	****	4.11	4.03	4.08	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	1									
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	son	5			Туј	pe			Majors	;			
00.27 0 0.00 0.00 0 7 0																		01
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 9 B 13		Rec	quire	ea Io	or Ma	ajor	s 2	4	Graduat	3	0	Majo	r	21
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	1	В 13 С 2		Ger	neral	ı				0	Under-q	rad 3	6	Non-	major	15
84-150 8 3.00-3.49 6 D 0						Gei	ıcıdı	_				U	onder -g.	Luu 3		11011	ilia JUL	1.3
						F] 4	ectiv	769				1	#### - 1	Meane t	here a	re not	enouio	rh
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 13 F 0						11.7		, 00				-	ππππ 1	icuito t	a		. ciioug	144

Other

0

Course-Section: ART 336 1 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Title Design & Tech II: Scre Instructor: Bell,Kathryn L

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 13

MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 103

		Ouestionnaire

			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	0	1	5	7	4.46	648/1509	4.46	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	605/1509	4.46	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	1101/1287	3.73	4.39	4.30	4.33	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	520/1459	4.46	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	6	1	3	3.31	1267/1406	3.31	3.81	4.09	4.12	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1132/1384	3.63	3.67	4.11	4.15	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	3	4	4	3.83	1155/1489	3.83	3.97	4.17	4.14	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1156/1506	4.42	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1179/1438	4.08	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1099/1421	4.58	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1135/1411	3.92	4.31	4.31	4.29	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	1	8	4.08	1010/1405	4.08	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	176/1236	4.67	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	496/1260	4.42	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	656/1255	4.42	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	620/1258	4.50	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	317/ 873	4.29	4.11	4.03	4.08	4.29

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	11	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4							
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2	
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant		
				I	0	Other	0	_				
		? 1										

Course-Section: ART 341 1 University of Maryland Page 104 Title Intro To Animation Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009

Instructor: Dyer,Eric

Enrollment: 11

Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

		Out of the control	_		NTD	3.7.7		-	ncies		_		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,skil	=	m this course	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	673/1509	4.44	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.44
		ctor make clear			3	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	992/1509	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.13
		estions reflect			2	6	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	708/1287	4.33	4.39	4.30	4.33	4.33
		ations reflect			2	1	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1111/1459	3.88	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.88
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	ıte to 1	what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1213/1406	3.44	3.81	4.09	4.12	3.44
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	o what you learned	2	4	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1017/1384	3.80	3.67	4.11	4.15	3.80
7. Was th	e gradino	g system clearly	v expla	ined	2	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	906/1489	4.11	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.11
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		2	0	0	0	1	7	1	4.00	1383/1506	4.00	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teacl	ning effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	853/1463	4.00	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.00
		Lecture																
1 Were ti	he instr	actor's lectures		arenared	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	904/1438	4 43	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.43
				4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.73	5.00	
			em interested in the subject presented and explained clearly				0	0	1	2		4.43		4.43	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.43
		es contribute to			4	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	- ,		4.31		4.32	
				our understanding	4	0	1	0	0	1	_		466/1236			4.00		
J. Dia au	alovibaai	r ccciniiques cin	lance y	our unactificationing	-	O	_	U	O	_	5	1.20	100/1250	1.20	1.12	1.00	1.07	1.20
		Discus																
				what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17			4.18	4.14	4.22	4.17
				d to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2		4.33	723/1255		4.41	4.33	4.37	4.33
				d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	324/1258		4.47	4.38	4.42	4.83
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		5	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	4.11	4.03	4.08	4.00
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	atio	n									
Credits E		Com CDA		Expected Grades				Da					m				M = = = = = =	
	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades					asons	; 			Туј	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 3		Re	quire	ed f	or Ma	jors	S	6	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot!	her					0						
				? 1														

Course-Section: ART 342 1

Title Film/Video Theory & Cr

Instructor: Worden, Frederic

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 105 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	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	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	862/1509	4.27	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	838/1509	4.27	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	578/1287	4.45	4.39	4.30	4.33	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	843/1459	4.18	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	389/1406	4.45	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	492/1384	4.36	3.67	4.11	4.15	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	216/1489	4.73	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	1118/1506	4.45	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	235/1463	4.63	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	1055/1438	4.27	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	768/1421	4.82	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	568/1411	4.55	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	381/1405	4.73	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	142/1236	4.73	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	582/1260	4.30	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	287/1255	4.80	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	486/1258	4.70	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	394/ 873	4.14	4.11	4.03	4.08	4.14

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	 5	Required for Majors	10	 Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	=			
				2	1						

Course-Section: ART 346 1 University of Maryland Page 106
Title Video II Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010
Instructor: Sheppard, Jenny Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 4

4

							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions					NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera																
1 Did voi	u gain ne	Genera ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	Λ	2	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.50
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	859/1509	4.25	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.25
		uestions reflec			0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	519/1287	4.50	4.39	4.30	4.33	4.50
	_	uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	191/1459	4.75	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.75
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	587/1406	4.25	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.25
	_	-		o what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	807/1384	4.00	3.67	4.11	4.15	4.00
		g system clearl		-	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	986/1489	4.00	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.00
	-	was class canc		inea	0	0	0	0	0	4	0		1383/1506	4.00	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.00
	-			hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.50
J. 110W WOO	Now would you grade the overall teaching effective Lecture Mere the instructor's lectures well prepared					O	O	O	O	2	_	1.50	323/1103	1.50	1.12	1.05	1.00	1.50
		Lectur																
1. Were th	he instr	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	447/1438	4.75	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.75		
2. Did the						0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was led	old the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clea					0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	617/1411	4.50	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.50
4. Did the	Was lecture material presented and explained clea: Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.50
5. Did aud	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.42	4.00	4.07	5.00
1 5 1 1		Discus			-	0	0	_	•	•	2	F 00	1 /1060	F 00	4 10	4 1 4	4 00	F 00
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.18	4.14	4.22	5.00
		-	_	d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1255	5.00	4.41	4.33	4.37	5.00
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.47	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssiul		1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.11	4.03	4.08	5.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Туј	ne .			Majors	:
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	4	Graduate	е	0	Majo	r	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0									response	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					0						

Course-Section: ART 347 1 University of Maryland Page 107 Title Writing For Media Arts Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Cook, Cathy

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 14

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

				Fre	mier	ncies	2		Tnat	ructor	Course	Dent	IIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	N.	Ά	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this cours	se 0		0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1		0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	605/1509	4.46	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goal	Ls 0		7	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	304/1287	4.71	4.39	4.30	4.33	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0 8		0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you lea	arned 1		0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	693/1406	4.15	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you 1	Learned 0		0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	123/1384	4.79	3.67	4.11	4.15	4.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0		0	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	802/1489	4.21	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0		0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1014/1506	4.57	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effecti	lveness 2		0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	726/1463	4.17	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.17
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3		0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	1055/1438	4.27	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	et 3		0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	768/1421	4.82	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained cle	early 3		0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	779/1411	4.36	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	- 3		0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	798/1405	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understa	anding 3		0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	392/1236	4.36	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.36
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you lea	arned 9		0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	209/1260	4.80	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to partici	ipate 9		0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.41	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discu	ıssion 9		0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	363/1258	4.80	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	9		1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	114/ 873	4.75	4.11	4.03	4.08	4.75
	Frequenc	y D	istı	ribu	tior	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected	Grades				Rea	sons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1	 LO]	 Requ	uire	d fo	or Ma	 ijor	 s 1	 1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r or	12

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 360 1 University of Maryland Page 108 Title Mixed Media Book Arts Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Chan, Irene

Instructor: Enrollment: 9

Questionnaires: 9

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	516/1509	4.57	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	3	2		1086/1509	4.00	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	0	1	1		****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	979/1459	4.00	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	2	0	1	2.50	1392/1406	2.50	3.81	4.09	4.12	2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	0	1	0	2	2.67	1366/1384	2.67	3.67	4.11	4.15	2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1391/1489	3.14	3.97	4.17	4.14	3.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1146/1506	4.43	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1168/1463	3.67	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.67
T a shows														
Lecture	_	0	0	0	2	1	2	4 00	1002/1420	4 00	4 20	1 16	4 42	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	Ţ	3		1203/1438		4.38	4.46	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421		4.77	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	4	0	2		1235/1411	3.67	4.31	4.31	4.29	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0 3	U	1	2	0			1334/1405		4.31	4.32	4.32	3.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	U	Т	Т	U	Т	3.33	1056/1236	3.33	4.42	4.00	4.07	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1133/1260	3.20	4.18	4.14	4.22	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	822/1255	4.20	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1126/1258	3.60	4.47	4.38	4.42	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 873	****	4.11	4.03	4.08	****
From	- o m a-	Diet	- n i b-	.+ 4 ~-	_									

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2009

Page 109

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 14 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ran	ık	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																	
1. Did vou	gain ne	w insights,skill	ls from th	is course	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	470/1	509	4.62	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.62
		tor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	720/1		4.38	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.38
		estions reflect			1	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1	.287	****	4.39	4.30	4.33	***
4. Did oth	er evalu	ations reflect	the expect	ed goals	1	1	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	686/1	459	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.33
5. Did ass	igned re	adings contribut	te to what	you learned	2	0	0	1	2	6	3	3.92	921/1	406	3.92	3.81	4.09	4.12	3.92
		ignments contril			1	0	0	1	5	4	3	3.69	1089/1	.384	3.69	3.67	4.11	4.15	3.69
		system clearly			1	0	0	0	2	3	8		, -		4.46	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.46
		was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	13	0		1383/1		4.00	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How wou	ld you g	rade the overal	l teaching	effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	579/1	.463	4.31	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.31
		Lecture																	
1. Were th	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	3	8	4.73	497/1	438	4.73	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.73
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clea					0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	768/1	421	4.82	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.82
3. Was lec	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clea Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	456/1	411	4.64	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.64
4. Did the	oid the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear oid the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	596/1	405	4.55	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.55
5. Did aud	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	248/1	.236	4.55	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.55
1 54 -1-]	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	1 (1	220/1	260	1 (1	4 10	1 1 1	4 22	1 (1
		ssions contribut ts actively enco			3 3	0	0	0	0 2	4 2	7	4.64	330/1 620/1		4.64 4.45	4.18 4.41	4.14	4.22 4.37	4.64 4.45
		tor encourage fa			3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.43	456/1		4.43	4.41	4.38	4.42	4.43
		chniques succes		en discussion	3	5	0	0	0	2	4	4.67			4.67				4.67
I. Mele Sp	00141 00	omizques succes.	5141				Ü	Ü	Ü	_	-	1.0,	102,	0,5	1.07		1.05	1.00	1.07
		Self Pa																	
		system contribut			13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	49	****	3.67	4.26	5.00	****
		ions make clear			13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
		cts with the ins			13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	46	****	4.00	4.31	5.00	****
		k/tutoring by page gh proctors for			13 13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ ****/	37 30	****	****	4.05 4.27	5.00	****
5. were th	ere enou	gn proctors for	all the s	tudents	13	U	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	***/	30			4.2/	5.00	
				Freq	uency	Dis	cribu	ution	n										
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA	₽.	xpected Grades				Pe:	asons	2				Тур	ne.			Majors	
										, 									
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3 1	2	Grad	luate	2	0	Majo	r	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 3			_					•							_
56-83 84-150	3 4	2.00-2.99	0 5	C 0 D 0		Gei	neral	L				0	Unde	er-gr	rad 1	4	Non-	major	1
84-150 Grad.	0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	4	D 0 F 0		. רים	ectiv	765				1	####	- 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	h
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	1	P 0		E16	\	(C)				_			es to b				11
				I O		Ot1	ner					0	ı cəp	.0110	L	c bigi	LLLCan		
				? 0		0.01						-							

Course-Section: ART 361 1

Title Digital Darkroom Instructor: Thompson, Calla

Enrollment: 14 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 110

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: ART 363 1 Color Photography

Title Instructor: Peregoy,Christo Fall 2009 Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 11 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					_					- .		~			- 1	a .
					Fre	-	ncie		_		ructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	Τ	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new		rom this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	339/1509	4.73	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.73
2. Did the instruct			0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	495/1509	4.55	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.55
3. Did the exam que		1 5	0	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evalua	tions reflect the	expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	96/1459	4.90	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.90
5. Did assigned read			1	3	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1225/1406	3.43	3.81	4.09	4.12	3.43
6. Did written assi	gnments contribute	to what you learned	0	6	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	807/1384	4.00	3.67	4.11	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading	system clearly exp	lained	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	243/1489	4.70	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.70
8. How many times wa	as class cancelled		1	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	1300/1506	4.20	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.20
9. How would you gra	ade the overall te	aching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	118/1463	4.80	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.80
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruc	Lecture . Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	4	5	4.56	737/1438	4.56	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.56
2. Did the instruct			0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	768/1421	4.82	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.82
3. Was lecture mate		3	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	138/1411	4.90	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.90
4. Did the lectures	_		2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	321/1405	4.78	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.78
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	67/1236	4.90	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.90
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus		o what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	287/1260	4.70	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.70
		-	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	287/1255	4.80	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.80
	 Were all students actively encouraged to participa Did the instructor encourage fair and open discuss 						0	1	9	4.90	236/1258	4.90	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.90
	. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discuss . Were special techniques successful						0	3	1	4.25	333/ 873	4.25	4.11	4.03	4.08	4.25
						ution	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Por	ason	~			Ty	20			Majors	
CIECTICS FULLECT	Cuiii. GPA	Expedied Grades				VG.	25011	5			1У.	P.C			Ma JULS	'

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

Course-Section: ART 364 1 Title

Studio Photography

Instructor: Durant,Mark R Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 111 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			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	1	0	4	11	4.56	528/1509	4.56	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	652/1509	4.44	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	302/1459	4.64	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1406	****	3.81	4.09	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1384	****	3.67	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	7	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	175/1489	4.78	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	990/1506	4.60	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	114/1463	4.82	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	514/1438	4.71	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	201/1411	4.85	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	309/1405	4.79	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	126/1236	4.75	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	150/1260	4.89	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.41	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	261/1258	4.89	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	114/ 873	4.75	4.11	4.03	4.08	4.75

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	-	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 367 1 University of Maryland Page 112 Title Alternative Processes Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Peregoy,Christo

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	244/1509	4.80	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	116/1509	4.90	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	647/1459	4.38	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	400/1406	4.44	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	3	1	2	3.11	1311/1384	3.11	3.67	4.11	4.15	3.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	630/1489	4.38	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	209/1463	4.67	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	363/1438	4.80	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	537/1421	4.90	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	243/1411	4.80	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.31	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	607/1236	4.11	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	_	4.56	383/1260	4.56	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.10	4.14	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	261/1258	4.89	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.75	114/ 873	4.09	4.47	4.03	4.42	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	T	5	U	U	U	Т	3	4.75	114/ 0/3	4.75	4.11	4.03	4.00	4.75
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	\$ 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	;

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ART 370 1 University of Maryland Page 113
Title Silkscreen Printing Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Chan, Irene

Enrollment: 12

Questionnaires: 11

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eane	ncies	3		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	374/1509	4.70	4.34		4.32	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	922/1509	4.20	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1108/1287	3.70	4.39	4.30	4.33	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	911/1459	4.10	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	2	2	3.50	1178/1406	3.50	3.81	4.09	4.12	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	. 1	0	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	1296/1384	3.20	3.67	4.11	4.15	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	5	1	3.50	1303/1489	3.50	3.97	4.17	4.14	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	917/1506	4.70	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	628/1463	4.25	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1203/1438	4.00	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	5		1107/1421	4.57	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	858/1411	4.29	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	,	4.14		4.32	4.32	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	1	2	2	n		1088/1236			4.00	4.07	3.20
5. Dia addiovipadi ecominques emanee your anderseanding	•	_	Ü	-	_	-	Ü	3.20	1000/1250	3.20	1.12	1.00	1.07	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	936/1260	3.75	4.18	4.14	4.22	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	904/1255	4.00	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1070/1258	3.75	4.47	4.38	4.42	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	861/ 873	2.33	4.11	4.03	4.08	2.33
Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				D.C.	asons	,			Tvi	20			Maiors	

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 380 1 University of Maryland Page 114 Title Hist & Theory Of Games Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: McDonald, David

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 34

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

		NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
		General															
			s from this course	0	0	0	2	7	9	16	4.15	998/1509		4.34	4.31	4.32	4.15
			he expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	13	17	4.38	720/1509	4.38	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.38
			the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	12	21	4.59	444/1287	4.59	4.39	4.30	4.33	4.59
			he expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	10	19	4.41	602/1459	4.41	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.41
	_	_	e to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	11	17	4.18	674/1406	4.18	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.18
			ute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	8	10	13	3.91	925/1384	3.91	3.67	4.11	4.15	3.91
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	explained	0	1	0	3	6	9	15	4.09	923/1489	4.09	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.09
8. How mar	ny times	was class cancel	led	0	0	0	0	1	14	19	4.53	1054/1506	4.53	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.53
9. How wou	uld you g	grade the overall	teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	7	7	12	4.19	690/1463	4.19	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.19
		Lecture															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures	well prepared	1	0	0	0	5	13	15	4.30	1032/1438	4.30	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.30
		ted in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	28	4.82		4.82	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.82	
		and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	6	7	20	4.42		4.42		4.31	4.29	4.42	
		es contribute to		2	0	0	1	2	9	20	4.50			4.31	4.32		4.50
			nce your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	8	24	4.70	,			4.00		4.70
		Discussi	~ - -														
			e to what you learned	14	0	0	3	2	7	8	4.00	746/1260	4.00	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.00
			uraged to participate	14	0	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	707/1255	4.35	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.35
		_	ir and open discussion	14	0	1	0	2	4	13	4.40	721/1258	4.40	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.40
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques success	ful	14	0	0	2	1	4	13	4.40	261/ 873	4.40	4.11	4.03	4.08	4.40
		Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n										
Credits Ea	arnod	Expected Grades				Por	ason	a			Ty	20			Majors		
	u	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades						.s 			ту. 	 Þe				, . – – – –
00-27	0		0 A 18		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s 2	14	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	10
28-55	4		0 B 10														
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	2 C 2	General							0	Under-g	rad 3	4	Non-	major	24
84-150																	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	0 F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				6	#### - 1	Means t		re not	enoug	ŗh

Other

0

Ρ

Ι

0

0

0

Course-Section: ART 382 1 University of Maryland Page 115 Title MAR 22, 2010

Intro Interactive Medi Baltimore County Fall 2009

Instructor: Smith,Ryan
Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 14

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

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	698/1509	4.53	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	667/1509	4.28	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	326/1287	4.41	4.39	4.30	4.33	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	667/1459	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	5	3	3.64	1116/1406	3.63	3.81	4.09	4.12	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	2	2	5	3.73	1069/1384	3.70	3.67	4.11	4.15	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	937/1489	3.91	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1506	4.94	4.60	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	809/1463	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	2	۵	4.36	981/1438	4.43	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	ρ		1206/1421	4.59	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36		4.18	4.77	4.73	4.29	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	733/1405	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	110/1236		4.42	4.00	4.07	
5. Dia addisvibadi ecominqueb emanee your anderbearding	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	3		1.75	110/1250	1.10	1.12	1.00	1.07	1.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	637/1260	3.78	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	611/1255	3.98	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	598/1258	4.02	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	442/ 873	3.63	4.11	4.03	4.08	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 46	****	4.00	4.31	5.00	***
Frem	0000-	Dict	- mi h-	.+ 4 6 -	_									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	4	Required for Majors	11	 Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	14	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-		_	
				2	1						

Course-Section: ART 382 2

Hartley,Tronste

University of Maryland

Baltimore County Intro Interactive Medi

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 8

Title

Instructor:

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 116 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	458/1509	4.53	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	992/1509	4.28	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	869/1287	4.41	4.39	4.30	4.33	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	686/1459	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	1128/1406	3.63	3.81	4.09	4.12	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1107/1384	3.70	3.67	4.11	4.15	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	0	4		1197/1489		3.97	4.17	4.14	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7		642/1506		4.60	4.67	4.67	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1133/1463	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	800/1438	4.43	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	881/1421	4.59	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	2	3		1051/1411		4.31	4.31	4.29	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	1	3		1191/1405	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.32	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	598/1236	4.46	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	1102/1260		4.18	4.14	4.22	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	3	0	2		1127/1255	3.98	4.41	4.33	4.37	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	3	0	2		1143/1258		4.47	4.38	4.42	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	771/ 873	3.63	4.11	4.03	4.08	3.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.88	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.94	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.85	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.46	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.25	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.75	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.67	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.33	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.00	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: ART 382 2

Intro Interactive Medi

Instructor: Hartley,Tronste

Enrollment: 8
Questionnaires: 8

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 116 MAR 22, 2010 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	A	2	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General		Under-grad	8	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	0	_			
				2	0						

University of Maryland Page 117
Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010
Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ctudont	Comman	Errolustion	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnarre

Course-Section: ART 383 1

Sound Design

16

Bradley, Stephen

Title

Instructor:
Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

	Frequencies I						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
	2	0	0	0	1	7	_	1 21	833/1509	1 21	4.34	1 21	1 22	4.31
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	,	2	4.31	720/1509	4.31	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	Τ	5	6	4.38	-,					
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	10	0	0	0	1	2		****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	4	9		247/1459		4.32	4.22	4.26	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	6	3	2		1178/1406		3.81	4.09	4.12	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	6	0	1	3	2	1		1226/1384		3.67	4.11	4.15	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	4	5	4		986/1489	4.00	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	7	6		1108/1506		4.60	4.67	4.67	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	815/1463	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	_	6	1 22	1001/1438	4.33	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	6 11	4.83	716/1421	4.83	4.30	4.73	4.43	4.83
g and a second s	4	0		0		-								
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	-	0	•	2	4	6	4.33	810/1411	4.33	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	,		4.31	4.32		4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	90/1236	4.83	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	287/1260	4.70	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	412/1255		4.41	4.33	4.37	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	486/1258	4.70	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	333/ 873		4.11	4.03	4.08	4.25
1. Note special committees successful	Ū	Ū	Ü	ŭ	_	_	_	1.25	333, 3.3	1125		1.05	1.00	1123
Frequ	ıency	Dist	crib	utio	n									
Credite Farned Cum CDN Expected Crades				Po	acon	-			Тъл	20			Majore	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ART 384 1

Intro 3D Animation

Title Instructor: Zuber, James R

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 118 MAR 22, 2010 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		om this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.34	4.31	4.32	5.00
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	,	4.92	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.92
		uestions reflec			1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	444/1287		4.39	4.30	4.33	4.58
	_	uations reflect		_	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.67
				what you learned	1	6	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	332/1406		3.81	4.09	4.12	4.50
				o what you learned	1	0	0	3	2	2	5		1050/1384		3.67	4.11	4.15	3.75
		g system clearl			1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1489	5.00	3.97	4.17	4.14	5.00
	-	was class canc		iiica	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	722/1506		4.60	4.67	4.67	4.83
				hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6		4.27			4.12		4.08	
J. 110W WO	ara you s	grade the overa	II ccac	iiiig circetiveness		O	O	O	_	O	-	1.27	000/1105	1.27	1.12	1.05	1.00	1.27
		Lecture																
		uctor's lecture			1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	700/1438		4.38	4.46	4.43	4.58
		ctor seem inter			1 2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	716/1421		4.77	4.73	4.73	4.83
	Was lecture material presented and explained clear: Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	1	3	7	4.55	568/1411	4.55	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.55
	oid the lectures contribute to what you learned Oid audiovisual techniques enhance your understand.						0	0	0	1	11	4.92	154/1405	4.92	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.92
5. Did au	diovisua	our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.42	4.00	4.07	5.00		
		Discus																
1 Did al	ace died		what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	746/1260	4.00	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.00	
				ed to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50			4.41	4.33	4.37	4.50
				d open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	620/1258	4.50	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.50
		echniques succe		d Open discussion	9	3	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 873		4.11	4.03	4.08	****
i. were b	pecial e	comingues succe	SSIGI			3	Ü	J	_	Ü	J	3.00	, 0,75			1.03	1.00	
		Labora	_															
2. Were y	ou provid	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
		Field	Work															
1. Did fi	eld exper	rience contribu	te to w	hat you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.61	****
				uation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.25	4.41	4.34	****
-	-	•																
1 Did ac	lf magad	Self :		what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	5.00	****
I. DIG Se	:II-paceu	system contrib	ute to	what you rearned	12	U	U	U	U	U		5.00	/ 49		3.07	4.20	5.00	
			Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	;	
00-27							quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s 1	.0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2				_				_		_	_			_
56-83							nera	Τ				0	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	-major	2
84-150												_						
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0						Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### -				_	ıh
P 0													respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
I 0						Otl	ner					0						
	? 0																	

Course-Section: ART 387 2 University of Maryland Page 119 Title Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Expression Time & Moti

Instructor: Dyer,Eric

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 10

Fall 2009 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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	256/1509		4.23	4.26	4.25	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	111/1459	4.88	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	1178/1406	3.50	3.81	4.09	4.12	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	458/1489	4.50	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1258/1506	4.25	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	646/1438	4.63	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	614/1421	4.88	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	303/1411	4.75	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	513/1405	4.63	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.42	4.00	4.07	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	Λ	Λ	Λ	Ω	4	4	4.50	415/1260	4.50	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	229/1255	4.88	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	535/1258	4.63	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	292/ 873		4.11	4.03	4.08	4.33

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

Course-Section: ART 390 1 Title

IRC Fellows Topics

Instructor: Nohe, Timothy

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 120 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Frequencies			Inst	tructor	Course	e 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	u gain ne	w insights,ski		n this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	410/1509	4.67	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.67
_	_	tor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	2	4		1002/1509		4.23	4.26	4.25	4.11
		estions reflec	_	_	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287		4.39	4.30	4.33	****
	_	ations reflect		_	0	3	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	979/1459	4.00	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.00
5. Did as	signed rea	adings contrib	ute to v	what you learned	0	6	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1333/1406	3.00	3.81	4.09	4.12	3.00
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1384	****	3.67	4.11	4.15	***
7. Was th	e grading	system clearly	y expla:	ined	0	4	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	823/1489	4.20	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.20
8. How ma	ny times v	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.12	4.09	4.08	5.00
		Lectur	<u> </u>															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture		prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	319/1438	4.83	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.83
		tor seem inter			3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1421		4.77	4.73	4.73	5.00
				plained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50			4.31	4.31	4.29	4.50
		s contribute to			3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	634/1405		4.31	4.32	4.32	4.50
				our understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1236		4.42	4.00	4.07	5.00
1 5441		3	_	^	0	^	1	^	2	4 50	415 /1060	4 50	4 10	1 1 1	4 00	4 50		
		what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	415/1260		4.18	4.14	4.22	4.50		
		_	_	d to participate d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1255 1/1258		4.41	4.33	4.37	5.00 5.00
		chniques succe		a open discussion	5 5	1	0	0	0	1	2		152/ 873		4.47 4.11	4.38		4.67
4. Were s	peciai ce	ciniiques succe	SSIUI		5	Τ.	U	U	U	_	4	4.07	132/ 6/3	4.07	4.11	4.03	4.00	4.07
		Labora	_															
2. Were y	ou provide	ed with adequa	te backs	ground information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria fo	or grading made	e clear		8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	3.94	****
		Field	Work															
1. Did fi	eld exper			nat you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.61	****
				ation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	4.25		4.34	****
		Self :	D 3															
1. Did se	lf-paced :			what vou learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	5.00	****
	1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned												,					
		Frequ	lency	Dis	tribu	utior	1											
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 9			 quire		 or M=	iors		2	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		100	-1~++((-	_	5244446	-	-		-	0
56-83							nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	-major	1
84-150 5 3.00-3.49 1 D 0													5				3	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0						Ele	ectiv	ves				4	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enou	_i h
Р 0													respons				_	
	I 0											3	-					

? 0

Course-Section: ART 395 1 University of Maryland Page 121 Title Television Production Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Shewbridge, Will

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 11

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	862/1509	4.27	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	495/1509	4.55	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	519/1287	4.50	4.39	4.30	4.33	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	0	2	6	4.20	834/1459	4.20	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	665/1406	4.18	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	1	1	4		1217/1384	3.44	3.67	4.11	4.15	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	4		1106/1489	3.91	3.97	4.17	4.14	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	990/1506	4.60	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	8	2	4.09	804/1463	4.09	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.09
. 3														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1147/1438	4.14	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	950/1421	4.71	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	858/1411	4.29	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1154/1405	3.86	4.31	4.32	4.32	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	354/1236	4.40	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	1246/1260	2.40	4.18	4.14	4.22	2.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1187/1255	3.20	4.41	4.33	4.37	3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1126/1258	3.60	4.47	4.38	4.42	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	4.11	4.03	4.08	4.00
Frequ	lency	Dist	crib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ART 424 1 Title

Contemp Art, Theory, Cr

Instructor: Smalls,James

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 122 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	<u> </u>					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.34	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	543/1509	4.50	4.23	4.26	4.26	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.38	***
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	131/1459	4.83	4.32	4.22	4.32	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	121/1406	4.83	3.81	4.09	4.11	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	96/1384	4.83	3.67	4.11	4.23	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	458/1489	4.50	3.97	4.17	4.18	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	941/1506	4.67	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.12	4.09	4.18	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	363/1438	4.80	4.38	4.46	4.50	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	794/1421	4.80	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1411	4.80	4.31	4.31	4.35	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.31	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	274/1236	4.50	4.42	4.00	4.03	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.18	4.14	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.41	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	549/1258	4.60	4.47	4.38	4.51	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.11	4.03	4.26	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.88	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.94	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.85	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.46	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	4.32	****

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

Course-Section: ART 428 1 University of Maryland Page 123 Title Theory/Prac Art Museum Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Jacob, Preminda

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 15

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

		-				ructor	Course Dept							
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	4	8	4.20	942/1509	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	1	10	4.27	849/1509		4.23	4.26	4.26	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	519/1287		4.39	4.30	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	619/1459	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.32	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	502/1406	4.33	3.81	4.09	4.11	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	4	7	4.07	773/1384	4.07	3.67	4.11	4.23	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	749/1489	4.27	3.97	4.17	4.18	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	662/1506	4.87	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	628/1463	4.25	4.12	4.09	4.18	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	219/1438	4.91	4.38	4.46	4.50	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	138/1411	4.90	4.31	4.31	4.35	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	381/1405	4.73	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	67/1236	4.91	4.42	4.00	4.03	4.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	337/1260	4.63	4.18	4.14	4.25	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	229/1255	4.88	4.41	4.33	4.46	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	8		1/1258		4.47	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.11	4.03	4.26	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 89	5.00	4.88	4.49	4.71	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.94	4.54	4.83	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 90	5.00	4.85	4.50	4.69	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	25/ 92	4.75	4.46	4.38	4.64	4.75
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	19/ 93	4.75	4.35	4.06	4.32	4.75
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	1
00.07														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	9	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	10
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ART 429 1 University of Maryland Page 124 Title Seminar: Art Hist & The Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Smalls, James

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4

84-150

Grad.

2

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

D

F

Ρ

I

0

0

0

0

0

	F	Fall	2009	
Student	Course	Evalu	ation	Ouestionnaire

Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Ouestions	NR	Fred NR NA 1			Frequencies 1 2 3 4		5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
׫«»»»														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	303/1509	4.75	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	256/1509	4.75	4.23	4.26	4.26	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.32	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1406	5.00	3.81	4.09	4.11	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	. 0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	349/1384	4.50	3.67	4.11	4.23	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	986/1489	4.00	3.97	4.17	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1070/1506	4.50	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	545/1463	4.33	4.12	4.09	4.18	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	800/1438	4.50	4.38	4.46	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	303/1411	4.75	4.31	4.31	4.35	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.42	4.00	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	244/1260	4.75	4.18	4.14	4.25	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	344/1255	4.75	4.41	4.33	4.46	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.47	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	292/ 873	4.33	4.11	4.03	4.26	4.33
Free	uency	/ Dis	strib	utio	n									
	_													
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту:	pe 			Majors 	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3	Required for Majo					ajors	5	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	2
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0	_													
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0		General						0	Under-g	rad 4		Non-major		2

Electives

0

Other

Course-Section: ART 430 1
Title Typography III
Instructor: Re,Margaret A

17

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 125 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

	Frequencies							Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	303/1509	3.73	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	543/1509	3.25	4.23	4.26	4.26	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	280/1459	3.77	4.32	4.22	4.32	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	4	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	587/1406	4.25	3.81	4.09	4.11	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	2	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	199/1384	4.02	3.67	4.11	4.23	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	1	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	833/1489	3.22	3.97	4.17	4.18	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	524/1506	4.46	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	774/1463	3.28	4.12	4.09	4.18	4.13
T o who we														
Lecture	_	0	0	0	1	4	_	4 40	020/1420	2 00	4 20	1 10	4 50	4 40
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	/	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	930/1438		4.38	4.46	4.50	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	2	7		1084/1421	4.22	4.77 4.31	4.73 4.31	4.76	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60 4.60	496/1411 540/1405	3.40 3.20	4.31	4.31	4.35	4.60 4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	2	1	Τ	1	4	3.50	984/1236		4.42	4.32	4.34	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	,	۷	۷	1	U	Т	4	3.50	904/1230	3.50	4.42	4.00	4.03	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	469/1260	3.52	4.18	4.14	4.25	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	540/1255	3.78	4.41	4.33	4.46	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	770/1258	4.17	4.47	4.38	4.51	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	152/ 873	4.67	4.11	4.03	4.26	4.67
Freq	iencv	Dist	rib	utio	ı									
	2													

Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	 7	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	1	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	0						

Typography III Coates,Joseph M Baltimore County Fall 2009 14

Questionnaires: 12

Course-Section: ART 430 2 University of Maryland Page 126 Title MAR 22, 2010 Instructor: Job IRBR3029 Enrollment:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	2	1	5	2	0	2.70	1491/1509	3.73	4.34	4.31	4.39	2.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	6	2	0	0	2.00	1505/1509	3.25	4.23	4.26	4.26	2.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	1	4	2	0	2.88	1444/1459	3.77	4.32	4.22	4.32	2.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	8	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1406	4.25	3.81	4.09	4.11	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1264/1384	4.02	3.67	4.11	4.23	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	2	4	0	2	0	2.25	1476/1489	3.22	3.97	4.17	4.18	2.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	8	1	4.00	1383/1506	4.46	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	1	6	0	0	2.44	1446/1463	3.28	4.12	4.09	4.18	2.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	2	1	2	0	0	2.00	1432/1438	3.20	4.38	4.46	4.50	2.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1373/1421	4.22	4.77	4.73	4.76	3.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	2	0	3	0	0	2.20	1402/1411	3.40	4.31	4.31	4.35	2.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	2	1	0	0	1.80	1400/1405	3.20	4.31	4.32	4.34	1.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1236	3.50	4.42	4.00	4.03	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	1	2	0	2 60	1238/1260	3.52	4.18	4.14	4.25	2.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	0	1	0	2		1202/1255	3.78	4.41	4.33	4.46	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	932/1258	4.17	4.47	4.38	4.51	4.00

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

Course-Section: ART 431 1 University of Maryland

Questionnaires: 14

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 127 Title Graphic Design III: Hu MAR 22, 2010 Instructor: Kozak,Jennifer (Instr. A) Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 14

			Fre	equer	ncie	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	470/1509	4.62	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.6
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	412/1509	4.62	4.23	4.26	4.26	4.6
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	519/1287	4.50	4.39	4.30	4.38	4.5
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	367/1459	4.58	4.32	4.22	4.32	4.5
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	332/1406	4.50	3.81	4.09	4.11	4.
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	677/1384	4.20	3.67	4.11	4.23	4.3
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	674/1489	4.33	3.97	4.17	4.18	4.
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	702/1506	4.85	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.12	4.09	4.18	4.
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	800/1438	4.75	4.38	4.46	4.50	4.
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	1060/1421	4.81	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	469/1411	4.71	4.31	4.31	4.35	4.
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	513/1405	4.81	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	2	0	1	5	4.13	598/1236	4.46	4.42	4.00	4.03	4.4
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.18	4.14	4.25	5.
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.41	4.33	4.46	5.
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	324/1258	4.83	4.47	4.38	4.51	4.
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	93/ 873	4.80	4.11	4.03	4.26	4.
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.88	4.49	4.71	* *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.94	4.54	4.83	**
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.85	4.50	4.69	**
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.46	4.38	4.64	* *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	4.32	**
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utior	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	3			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 9			 guir		 or M:		 a 1		Graduat		0	 Majo		11

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 431 1 University of Maryland Title Graphic Design III: Hu

Baltimore County

Instructor: Bergin, Josephin (Instr. B) Enrollment: 14 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questionnaires: 14

Page 128 MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions					NR	NA	Fre	-	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	w insights,ski	_	m this course	1	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	470/1509	4.62	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.62
		tor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	412/1509	4.62	4.23	4.26	4.26	4.62
		estions reflec			1	9	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	519/1287	4.50	4.39	4.30	4.38	4.50
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	1	1	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	367/1459	4.58	4.32	4.22	4.32	4.58
				what you learned	1	9	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	332/1406	4.50	3.81	4.09	4.11	4.50
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	1	8	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	677/1384	4.20	3.67	4.11	4.23	4.20
		system clearly		ained	2	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	674/1489	4.33	3.97	4.17	4.18	4.33
	-	was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	702/1506	4.85	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.85
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.12	4.09	4.18	4.50
		Lecture	9															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1438	4.75	4.38	4.46	4.50	4.75
2. Did th	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	4.81	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.81
3. Was le	Was lecture material presented and explained cle					0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1411	4.71	4.31	4.31	4.35	4.71
4. Did th	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1405	4.81	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.81
5. Did au	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understar						0	0	0	1	4	4.80	100/1236	4.46	4.42	4.00	4.03	4.46
		Discus																
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ite to	what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.18	4.14	4.25	5.00
2. Were a	ll studen	ts actively en	courage	ed to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.41	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did th	e instruc	tor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	324/1258	4.83	4.47	4.38	4.51	4.83
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		8	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	93/ 873	4.80	4.11	4.03	4.26	4.80
		Semina	<u>r</u>															
1. Were a	ssigned to	opics relevant	to the	announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.88	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was th	e instruc	tor available :	for ind	lividual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.94	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did re	search pr	ojects contrib	ate to	what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.85	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did pr	esentatio:	ns contribute	co what	you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.46	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading made	e clear	•	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	4.32	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	ı									
Credits E	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Re	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s 1	.0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0				_				_		_				_
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ge:	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	-major	3
84-150 4 3.00-3.49 3 D 0														_				,
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0						El	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	n
				P 0		٥.	1					0	respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
	I 0						her					0						
				? 1														

Course-Section: ART 435 1 University of Maryland Title Topics In Film/Video Baltimore County

Topics In Film/Video Baltimore County Worden, Frederic Fall 2009

Instructor: Worden,Frederic
Enrollment: 12

rollment: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 129 MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires: 12 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2 0 0 0 1 4 5 4.40 724/1509 4.40 4.34 4.31 4.39 4.40 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 2 0 0 0 5 5 4.50 543/1509 4.50 4.23 4.26 4.26 4.50 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 6 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 261/1287 4.75 4.39 4.30 4.38 4.75 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 3 0 0 1 3 2 3 3.78 1182/1459 3.78 4.32 4.22 4.32 3.78 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 2 1 1 2 2 2 3.38 1246/1406 3.38 3.81 4.09 4.11 3.38 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 0 3 3 4 4.10 917/1489 4.10 3.97 4.17 4.18 4.10 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 1 9 4.90 583/1506 4.90 4.60 4.67 4.67 4.90 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 1 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 151/1463 4.75 4.12 4.09 4.18 4.75 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 0 0 5 5 4.50 800/1438 4.50 4.38 4.46 4.50 4.50 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1421 5.00 4.77 4.73 4.76 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 0 1 4 4 4.33 810/1411 4.33 4.31 4.31 4.35 4.33 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 5 5 4.50 634/1405 4.50 4.31 4.32 4.34 4.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0 0 0 0 3 6 4.67 176/1236 4.67 4.42 4.00 4.03 4.67 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 4 5 4.56 383/1260 4.56 4.18 4.14 4.25 4.56 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 629/1255 4.44 4.41 4.33 4.46 4.44 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 3 6 4.67 507/1258 4.67 4.47 4.38 4.51 4.67 4. Were special techniques successful 4 2 0 0 2 2 2 4.00 442/873 4.00 4.11 4.03 4.26 4.00 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.22 4.37 **** Seminar 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 11 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.94 4.54 4.83 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.75 4.39 4.75 **** Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 484 1 University of Maryland Page 130 Title Advncd 3D Cmputr Anima Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: McDonald, David

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 15

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		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	2	0	0	2	5	0	6	3.77	1301/1509	3.77	4.34	4.31	4.39	3.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	3	3	1	4	3.15	1449/1509	3.15	4.23	4.26	4.26	3.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	2	2	2	5	3.67	1238/1459	3.67	4.32	4.22	4.32	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	11	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1406	****	3.81	4.09	4.11	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	3.67	4.11	4.23	****
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	2	0	1	1	3	5	3		1258/1489	3.62	3.97	4.17	4.18	3.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	2	10		722/1506	4.83	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	2	4	1	1	2.89	1412/1463	2.89	4.12	4.09	4.18	2.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	3	3	4	0	3	2.77	1421/1438	2.77	4.38	4.46	4.50	2.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	2	1	2	7	3.92	1363/1421	3.92	4.77	4.73	4.76	3.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	2	5	0	3	2.85	1383/1411	2.85	4.31	4.31	4.35	2.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	3	2	1	4	3.17	1334/1405	3.17	4.31	4.32	4.34	3.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	1	4	2	4	3.38	1038/1236	3.38	4.42	4.00	4.03	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	982/1260	3.67	4.18	4.14	4.25	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	1	3	3		1084/1255	3.67	4.41	4.33	4.46	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	Τ	Τ	2	Τ	4		1102/1258	3.67	4.47	4.38	4.51	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	U	0	3	0	2	3.80	585/ 873	3.80	4.11	4.03	4.26	3.80

Frequency Distribution

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 486 1 University of Maryland Page 131 Title Adv Interactive Media Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: McDonald, David

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 13

			00 011	-1
	I	Fall	2009	
Student	Course	Evalua	ation	Ouestionnaire
Scudenc	COULSE	Evalue	a C I OII	Quescionnaire

Job IRBR3029

	Questions				NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did voi	u dain n	Genera ew insights,ski		m this source	Δ	0	1	0	2	2	4	3 80	1228/1509	3.89	4.34	4.31	4.39	3.89
		ctor make clear			4	0	1	0	3	3	2		1351/1509	3.56	4.23	4.26	4.26	3.56
		uestions reflec			4	2	1	0	0	2	4		857/1287	4.14	4.39	4.30	4.38	4.14
	_	uations reflect		_	4	1	0	1	3	3	1		1314/1459	3.50	4.32	4.22	4.32	3.50
				what you learned	4	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	****	3.81	4.09	4.11	****
	_	-		what you learned	4	6	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1384	****	3.67	4.11	4.23	****
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	4	0	1	1	4	0	3	3.33	1359/1489	3.33	3.97	4.17	4.18	3.33
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	622/1506	4.89	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.89
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	4	1	0	1	5	2	0	3.13	1375/1463	3.13	4.12	4.09	4.18	3.13
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1400/1438	3.13	4.38	4.46	4.50	3.13
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1195/1421	4.44	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.44
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Was lecture material presented and explained clear					0	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	1337/1411	3.22	4.31	4.31	4.35	3.22
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	4	0	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	1185/1405	3.78	4.31	4.32	4.34	3.78
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	5	1	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	877/1236	3.71	4.42	4.00	4.03	3.71
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1260	****	4.18	4.14	4.25	***
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1255	****	4.41	4.33	4.46	***
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1258	****	4.47	4.38	4.51	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00 07														- 				
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 4 B 3		ке	quir	ea I	or Ma	ıjors		9	Graduat	е	0	Majo)r.	/
28-55 56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	B 3		Co	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	.3	Non	-major	6
	84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0					GE	пета.	_				U	onder-9	rau 1		MOII-	iia jui	U
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0					E1.	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means +	here a	re not	enous	rh	
oraa.	9 0					יבני	CCCI	v CD				J	respons				_	111
	I 0					Ot]	her					0	10050110					

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2009

Page 132 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

Course-Section: ART 488 1

Adv Topics:Aim

Bailey,Dan

17

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did wo	u gain n	Genera ew insights,ski		m thia gourgo	4	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	127/1509	4.92	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.92
		ew insignes,ski ctor make clear			4	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.62	412/1509		4.23	4.26	4.26	4.62
		uestions reflec			5	3	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	359/1287		4.39	4.30	4.38	4.67
		uations reflect			4	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	421/1459		4.32	4.22	4.32	4.54
				what you learned	4	10	0	0	0	1	2		****/1406		3.81	4.09	4.11	****
	_	g system clearl		_	4	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	513/1489		3.97	4.17	4.18	4.46
		was class canc			4	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	917/1506		4.60	4.67	4.67	4.69
	-			hing effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	73/1463		4.12	4.09	4.18	4.92
	-			3														
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	1	2	10	4.69	545/1438	4.69	4.38	4.46	4.50	4.69
2. Did the	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was le	Was lecture material presented and explained clea						0	0	0	4	9	4.69	376/1411	4.69	4.31	4.31	4.35	4.69
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.31	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	4	1	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.42	4.00	4.03	5.00
		Discus																
				what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	- ,		4.18	4.14	4.25	4.83
				d to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1255		4.41	4.33	4.46	5.00
		_		d open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1258		4.47	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		11	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.11	4.03	4.26	****
				Frequ	uency	Dis	trib	ution	ı									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	00.07								or Ma			. – – – – . O	 Graduat		0	Majo		13
28-55	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3					ке	quire	eu I	or Ma	Jor	ъ I	. 4	Graduat	E	U	Ma J	JΤ	13
	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	.7	Non-	-major	4
84-150 5 3.00-3.49 1 D 0					00.	с.а.	-				J	onaci -g	144 1	- *	14011		1	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0					E1	ecti	ves.				1	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enouc	rh	
oraa.	U	3.30 1.00	1	P 0	Electives					_	respons				_)++		
				I 0		O+1	her					0	TCBPOHB		,c 5191.	ıııcaı	10	
				2 1		00						J						

Course-Section:ART 489 1University of MarylandTitleSenior ProjectsBaltimore CountyInstructor:Sturgeon, JohnFall 2009

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

8

Page 133 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

Questions				equei 2		s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~		NA 												
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1461/1509	3.17	4.34	4.31	4.39	3.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1419/1509	3.33	4.23	4.26	4.26	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	1143/1459	3.83	4.32	4.22	4.32	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	2	0	0		1398/1406		3.81	4.09	4.11	2.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	-	0		1	0		1286/1384		3.67	4.11	4.23	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1		0	2	2	1		1176/1489		3.97	4.17	4.18	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1506		4.60	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	853/1463	4.00	4.12	4.09	4.18	4.00
Lecture	_			•	_					4 00	4 00		4 = 0	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	-	0	0	4	2		1001/1438					
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1421			4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0		0		4			810/1411			4.31	4.35	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3				1220/1405			4.32	4.34	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	Т	U	U	2	3	4.00	664/1236	4.00	4.42	4.00	4.03	4.00
Discussion														
	0	0	0	^	1	2	_	4 1 7	601/1060	4 1 7	4 10	1 1 1	4 05	4 1 7
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1 1	3			681/1260			4.14	4.25	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	-	0		3			723/1255 620/1258		4.41	4.33	4.46 4.51	4.33 4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	0	0	3 1		****/ 873			4.38	4.26	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	/ 6/3		4.11	4.03	4.20	
Freq	ionati	, Die	trib	11+ i 01	2									
1104	acticy	DIL	CLID	acio	.1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 5		Re	equir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	S	6	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	6
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1														
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	2
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 2 D 0														
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1					h
P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	t	
I 0		Ot	her					0						
? 0														

Course-Section: ART 492 1

Title

Instructor:
Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Topics:Art Or Media II Bal

Rosenberg, Jason

Rosenberg,Ja 10 Fall 2009

Page 134 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	673/1509	4.44	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	774/1509	4.33	4.23	4.26	4.26	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.32	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1009/1406	3.80	3.81	4.09	4.11	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1296/1384	3.20	3.67	4.11	4.23	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	0	2	3	1	0		1430/1489	2.83	3.97	4.17	4.18	2.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4			1030/1506	4.56	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	598/1463	4.29	4.12	4.09	4.18	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	800/1438	4.50	4.38	4.46	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1421		4.77	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	768/1411	4.38	4.31	4.31	4.35	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	383/1236	4.38	4.42	4.00	4.03	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	666/1260	4.20	4.18	4.14	4.25	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	665/1255	4.40	4.41	4.33	4.46	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	721/1258	4.40	4.47	4.38	4.51	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 873	****	4.11	4.03	4.26	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.62	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.29	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.88	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.94	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.85	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.46	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.25	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.75	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.67	4.18	4.19	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.33	4.32	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	4.00	4.31	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.33	****

Course-Section: ART 492 1

Topics:Art Or Media II

Instructor: Rosenberg, Jason

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 10

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 134 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

# Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 610 1

Imag. Digital Seminar

Title Instructor: Bradley,Stephen

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 5

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 135 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions		NR	NA	Fr 1	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Ran		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
		 Genera	 1																
1. Did you	u gain new	insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1	509	5.00	4.34	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	256/1	509	4.75	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.75				
3. Did the	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1	287	****	4.39	4.30	4.22	****				
4. Did otl	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	770/1	459	4.25	4.32	4.22	4.16	4.25				
5. Did as	signed rea	dings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	332/1	406	4.50	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.50
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	986/1	489	4.00	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How man	ny times w	as class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	990/1	506	4.60	4.60	4.67	4.71	4.60
9. How wor	uld you gr	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	853/1	463	4.00	4.12	4.09	4.15	4.00
		Lectur	e																
1. Were th	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1116/1	438	4.20	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.20			
2. Did the	e instruct	or seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1	421	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was le	cture mate	rial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	496/1	411	4.60	4.31	4.31	4.33	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	285/1	405	4.80	4.31	4.32	4.33	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding							0	0	0	2	3	4.60	211/1	236	4.60	4.42	4.00	3.98	4.60
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cla	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	352/1	260	4.60	4.18	4.14	4.21	4.60				
2. Were a	ll student	s actively en	courage	d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	287/1	255	4.80	4.41	4.33	4.43	4.80
3. Did the	e instruct	or encourage	fair an	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	721/1	258	4.40	4.47	4.38	4.50	4.40
4. Were s	pecial tec	hniques succe	ssful		0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	442/	873	4.00	4.11	4.03	4.01	4.00
		Semina	r																
1. Were as	ssigned to	pics relevant	to the	announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	43/	89	4.75	4.88	4.49	4.39	4.75
2. Was the	e instruct	or available	for ind	ividual attention	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	39/	92	4.75	4.94	4.54	4.52	4.75
3. Did re	search pro	jects contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/	90	5.00	4.85	4.50	4.48	5.00
		s contribute			1	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	79/	92	3.75	4.46	4.38	4.30	3.75
5. Were c	riteria fo	or grading mad	e clear		1	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	67/	93	3.75	4.35	4.06	4.04	3.75
		Self	Paced																
1. Did se	lf-paced s	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	49	****	3.67	4.26	4.16	***
2. Did st	udy questi	ons make clea	r the e	xpected goal	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	41	****	****	4.14	4.08	****
-		ts with the i		-	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	46	****	4.00	4.31	4.11	****
4. Was the	e feedback	/tutoring by	proctor	s helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	37	****	****	4.05	3.69	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades								Rea	asons					Тур	oe			Majors	}
00 07														1			0		
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	1 0	A 2 B 0	Required for Majo						ò	3	Grad	uate	=	4	Majo	)r.	U
28-55 56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		General						0	Unde	~- ~-	rad.	1	Mos	mo dos	5
56-83 84-150	0	3.00-2.99	0	D 0		Ge	uera	т				U	onde	:r -91	Lau	Т	MOI1-	-major	5
Grad. 4 3.50-4.00 0 F 0					Til a mháirean							0	####	1	Means t	here -	are not	enous	rh
Grad.	Grad. 4 3.50-4.00 0 F 0				Electives							U			means t es to b			_	111
				I O		O+1	her					1	resp	,011D¢	רט רט ד	o argi	ıııcaı	10	
				? 2		00	LICI					_							
				. 4															

Course-Section: ART 620 1 Hist I&D Arts Baltimore County Mahoney,James W

University of Maryland Page 136 MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 5 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title

Instructor:

	Oue at the area				3.7.3		_	equencies		_		tructor	Course	_		Level	Se
		Questions		NR 	NA 	1 	2	3 	- <del>4</del> 	5 	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Ме 
		General															
. Did you	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	303/1509		4.34	4.31	4.39	4.			
. Did the	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	256/1509		4.23	4.26	4.25	4.			
. Did the	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287		4.39	4.30	4.22	* *			
. Did othe	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	191/1459		4.32	4.22	4.16	4.			
. Did assi	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1406		3.81	4.09	4.12	5.			
			ute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3		149/1384		3.67	4.11	4.16	4
		system clearly	-	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489		3.97	4.17	4.14	5
-		was class cancel		1	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1506		4.60	4.67	4.71	5.
. How woul	.d you g	grade the overall	teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	151/1463	4.75	4.12	4.09	4.15	4.
		Lecture															
. Were the	instru	ctor's lectures	well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.38	4.46	4.49	5.
Did the	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.78	5			
. Was lect	ure mat	erial presented	and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	303/1411	4.75	4.31	4.31	4.33	4
. Did the	lecture	es contribute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.31	4.32	4.33	5
Did audi	ovisual.	techniques enha	nce your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	126/1236	4.75	4.42	4.00	3.98	4
		Discussi	on														
Did clas	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.18	4.14	4.21	5			
Were all	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	344/1255		4.41	4.33	4.43	4			
Did the	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.47	4.38	4.50	5			
Were spe	cial te	chniques success	ful	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.11	4.03	4.01	*
		Seminar															
Were ass	igned t	opics relevant t	o the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	43/ 89	4.75	4.88	4.49	4.39	4
			r individual attention	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.94	4.54	4.52	5
Did rese	arch pr	ojects contribut	e to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	41/ 90	4.67	4.85	4.50	4.48	4
Did pres	entatio	ons contribute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	25/ 92	4.75	4.46	4.38	4.30	4
Were cri	teria f	for grading made	clear	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	33/ 93	4.50	4.35	4.06	4.04	4
		Self Pa	ced														
Did self	-paced		e to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	4.16	*
Did stud	ly quest	ions make clear	the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.08	*
Were you	r conta	acts with the ins	tructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	4.00	4.31	4.11	*
			Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
 )0-27	1	0.00-0.99	1 A 3								 4	 Graduat		3	Made		
10-27 28-55	0		0 B 0	Required for Majors						٥	4	Graduat	C	J	Majo	) <u>T</u>	
6-83	0		0 C 0	General							0	Under-q	rad	2	Non-	-major	
4-150	0		0 D 0		00.	u	_				,	011461 9	_ ~~	_	2.011		
Frad. 3 3.50-4.00 0 F 0					Ele	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enous	ah
	-	2.00 2.00	P 0								-	respons				_	
			I O		Ot.	her					0					-	
			? 1		0.0.						-						

Course-Section: ART 640 1

Title Imaging & Digital Stud

Instructor: Cazabon, Lynn

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2009

Page 137 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions				Frequer NR NA 1 2							Ins Mean	Instructor Mean Rank		ourse Mean	-		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		Genera	 al																	
1. Did y	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	724/150	9	4.40	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.40	
2. Did t	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals							0	1	5	4	4.30	807/150	9	4.30	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals							0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/128	7	****	4.39	4.30	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals							0	0	1	5	4	4.30	715/145	9	4.30	4.32	4.22	4.16	4.30	
5. Did a	ssigned r	eadings contrib	oute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	623/140	6	4.22	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.22	
6. Did w	ritten as	signments contr	ribute t	o what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	260/138	4	4.63	3.67	4.11	4.16	4.63	
7. Was t	he gradin	g system clearl	ly expla	ined	1	4	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	823/148	9	4.20	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.20	
	_	was class cand			2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/150		5.00	4.60	4.67	4.71	5.00	
9. How w	ould you	grade the overa	all teac	thing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	545/146	3	4.33	4.12	4.09	4.15	4.33	
		Lectur	re																	
1. Were	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	2	7	4.78	413/143	8	4.78	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.78	
2. Did t	he instru	ctor seem inter	rested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	588/142	1	4.89	4.77	4.73	4.78	4.89	
		_		explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	416/141	1	4.67	4.31	4.31	4.33	4.67	
		es contribute t		-	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	634/140	5	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.33	4.50	
5. Did a	udiovisua	l techniques en	nhance y	our understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	242/123	6	4.56	4.42	4.00	3.98	4.56	
		Discus				0	0													
	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned							0	2	2	6	4.40	505/126		4.40	4.18	4.14	4.21	4.40	
		_	_	ed to participate	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	575/125		4.50	4.41	4.33	4.43	4.50	
		_		d open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	721/125		4.40	4.47	4.38	4.50	4.40	
4. Were	special t	echniques succe	essful		0	2	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	550/ 87	3	3.88	4.11	4.03	4.01	3.88	
		Semina																		
				announced theme	4	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	,		5.00	4.88	4.49	4.39	5.00	
				lividual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	, .		5.00	4.94	4.54	4.52	5.00	
	_	-		what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	,		4.71	4.85	4.50	4.48	4.71	
_		ons contribute for grading mad		-	3	0 2	0	0	0 1	3 1	4 3	4.57 4.40			4.57 4.40	4.46 4.35	4.38	4.30	4.57 4.40	
			1																	
1 544 6		Field		h	0	0	^	0	0	^	_	F 00	****	0		4 75	4 20	1 26	****	
				hat you learned	8 9	0	0	0	0	0	2 1	5.00	,	8	****	4.75	4.39	4.36	****	
4. TO WIN	at degree	could you disc	cuss you	r evaluations	9	Ü	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	****/ 4	7		4.67	4.18	4.03	* * * *	
1 543	-161	Self			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	*****///	0	****	2 67	4 06	4 16	***	
	_	_		what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		,		~~~~	3.67 ****	4.26	4.16	****	
		tions make clea		_	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	1	****		4.14	4.08	****	
	-	acts with the i ck/tutoring by		-	9 9	0	0	0	0	0 1	1 0		,	. 0	****	4.00	4.31	4.11 3.69	****	
			-	_		- D-1	1 1		_											
				Frequ	iency	DIS	trib	utio	n											
Credits 1	edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							Rea	asons				7	'ype				Majors	5	
00-27					Required for Major						s 1	0	Gradua	te		5	Majo	or	9	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0																
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		General						0	Under-	gra	.d	5	Non-	major	1	
84-150																_				
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives							0						enoug	jh	
				P 0								•	respor	ses	to b	e sign	ificar	ıt		
I 0						Other						0								