Course-Section: ART 210 0201 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS Instructor: KISSACK, LYLE 15

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 78 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Question	a		NTD	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	_		tructor Rank	Course	_		Level Mean	
		Question	s 		NR	NA			3	- 4 	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	1148/1576	4.31	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.00
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	2	0	4	4	4.00	1138/1576	4.58	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.00
3. Did th	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.41	***
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	1	3	1	1	3	3.22	1444/1520	4.27	4.33	4.25	4.26	3.22
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1465	4.00	3.86	4.12	4.09	****
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1434	3.53	3.72	4.14	4.06	****
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	1	2	0	4	0	3	3.22	1418/1547	4.31	4.01	4.19	4.22	3.22
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	1367/1574	4.17	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.20
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	6	1	3.75	1166/1554	4.12	4.15	4.10	4.05	3.75
		Lectur																
1. Were t	he instr	prepared	1	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1349/1488	4.53	4.40	4.47	4.44	3.78		
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	868/1493	4.79	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.78
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	2	0	1	1	0	5	1	3.50	1330/1486	4.33	4.33	4.32	4.29	3.50
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1200/1489	4.60	4.28	4.32	4.31	3.89
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	3	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	839/1277	4.31	4.38	4.03	4.01	3.83
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	802/1279	4.47	4.19	4.17	4.14	4.00
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	855/1270	4.43	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.20
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	852/1269	4.62	4.50	4.35	4.29	4.20
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		5	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	3.92	****
				Frequ	.ency	Dist	rib	ution	1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Pos	asons	,			Ty	ne			Majors	
CLEGICS F										, 				 he				
00-27								ed fo	or Ma	jors		1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	5
28-55	0	В 2																
56-83	0	C 1		Ger	nera:	l				1	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	major	5		
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		$El\epsilon$	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	_J h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	

Other

7

I

0

University of Maryland ltimore County

ng 2009

Page 79

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Title	VISUAL CONCEPTS	Baltimore
Instructor:	SHIFLET, NICOLE	Spring
Enrollment:	10	

Course-Section: ART 210 0301

Questionnaires:	6		Studer	nt Co	urse	Evalı	atio	on Qu	ıesti	lonna	ire	
							Fre	equer	ncies	5		
	Ques	tions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	N

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	861/1576	4.31	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	201/1576	4.58	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	197/1520	4.27	4.33	4.25	4.26	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1242/1465	4.00	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1263/1434	3.53	3.72	4.14	4.06	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1547	4.31	4.01	4.19	4.22	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.17	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	805/1554	4.12	4.15	4.10	4.05	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	401/1488	4.53	4.40	4.47	4.44	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	810/1493	4.79	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	271/1486	4.33	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	4.60	4.28	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	404/1277	4.31	4.38	4.03	4.01	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	335/1279	4.47	4.19	4.17	4.14	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	784/1270	4.43	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	535/1269	4.62	4.50	4.35	4.29	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	3.92	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	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	Ĺ
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	_			
				?	1						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ART 210 0401

15

VISUAL CONCEPTS

SHIFLET, NICOLE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 10

Page 80 JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Questions						Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 															
1. Did vou	ı gain ne	w insights,skil	=	this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	500/1576	4.31	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.60
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	152/1576	4.58	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.90
		estions reflect			0	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.41	5.00
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	197/1520	4.27	4.33	4.25	4.26	4.80
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	0	4	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	366/1465	4.00	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.50
6. Did wri	tten ass	ignments contri	bute to	what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1142/1434	3.53	3.72	4.14	4.06	3.67
7. Was the	grading	system clearly	z explai	ned	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	303/1547	4.31	4.01	4.19	4.22	4.70
8. How mar	y times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	1288/1574	4.17	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.30
9. How wou	ild you g	rade the overal	ll teach	ing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	504/1554	4.12	4.15	4.10	4.05	4.43
		Lecture																
1 Wara th	the instructor's lectures well prepared				0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1488	4.53	4.40	4.47	4.44	5.00
	the instructor seem interested in the subject				0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	810/1493	4.79	4.40	4.47	4.75	4.80
	I the instructor seem interested in the subject slecture material presented and explained clearly				0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	422/1486	4.73	4.33	4.32	4.75	4.70
					0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	194/1489	4.60	4.28	4.32		4.90
				ur understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	194/1277		4.38	4.03		4.70
J. DIG auc	ilovibuai	ceciniiques em	iance yo	ar anaerscanaring	U	U	U	U	U	J	,	1.70	174/12//	1.31	1.50	1.03	1.01	1.70
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1279	4.47	4.19	4.17	4.14	4.75
2. Were al	ll studen	ts actively end	couraged	to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	412/1270	4.43	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.75
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage i	air and	open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	4.62	4.50	4.35	4.29	5.00
4. Were sp	ecial te	chniques succes	ssful		6	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	3.92	****
				Freq	uency	/ Dis	tribu	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	}
00-27						Re	guire	ed f	or Ma	jor	 s	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	3
28-55							_			-						_		
56-83					Gei	nera:	L				3	Under-g	rad 1	0	Non-	major	7	
84-150	0 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0												_				-	
Grad.	0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0					Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					5						
				? 0														

Course-Section: ART 211 0101 University of Maryland Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM

Baltimore County Spring 2009 FARRELL, JOHN J Instructor:

Enrollment: 16 Questio

ionnaires:	12	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
------------	----	---------	--------	------------	---------------

?

0

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies	s 4	5	Ins Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	
		Genera	1															
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	861/1576	4.52	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.33
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	392/1576	4.44	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.67
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	249/1520	4.54	4.33	4.25	4.26	4.75
	_	_		what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	4	2	3.25	1337/1465	3.75	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.25
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	2	0	3	2	3	2	3.40	1263/1434	3.60	3.72	4.14	4.06	3.40
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	375/1547	4.52	4.01	4.19	4.22	4.64
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1018/1574	4.23	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.58
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	871/1554	4.30	4.15	4.10	4.05	4.10
		Lectur																
1. Were th	re the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	624/1488	4.71	4.40	4.47	4.44	4.70
2. Did the	the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	810/1493	4.85	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.80
3. Was led	d the instructor seem interested in the subject s lecture material presented and explained clear					0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	561/1486	4.72	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.60
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1057/1489	4.49	4.28	4.32	4.31	4.11
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	243/1277	4.66	4.38	4.03	4.01	4.63
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	554/1279	4.55	4.19	4.17	4.14	4.40
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	559/1270	4.70	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.60
				d open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	584/1269	4.70	4.50	4.35	4.29	4.60
				Frequ	ency	, Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajors	5	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	7
28-55						_							1	, .	_			_
56-83						Ger	nera:	L				2	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0								_						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	ŗh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner					8						

Page 81

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: ART 211 0201

VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM

Title Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 13

Baltimore County Spring 2009

University of Maryland

Page 82 JUL 2, 2009 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		rom this course	Ο	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	976/1576	4.52	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.23
2. Did the instruct	9 .		0	0	0	1	2	6	4		1138/1576	4.44	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.00
3. Did the exam que		1 3	0	11	0	0	0	1	1		****/1342	4.89	4.58	4.32	4.41	****
4. Did other evalua		1 3	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	805/1520	4.54	4.33	4.25	4.26	4.31
5. Did assigned rea		_	0	0	2	2	2	4	3	3.31	1328/1465	3.75	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.31
_	_	to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	3	3	3.31	1301/1434	3.60	3.72	4.14	4.06	3.31
7. Was the grading	system clearly expl	ained	1	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	673/1547	4.52	4.01	4.19	4.22	4.42
8. How many times w	as class cancelled		1	0	0	0	0	10	2	4.17	1386/1574	4.23	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.17
9. How would you gr	ade the overall tea	aching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	881/1554	4.30	4.15	4.10	4.05	4.08
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruc	tor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	834/1488	4.71	4.40	4.47	4.44	4.54
2. Did the instruct	or seem interested	in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	1113/1493	4.85	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.62
3. Was lecture mate	rial presented and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	545/1486	4.72	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.62
4. Did the lectures	lecture material presented and explained clear the lectures contribute to what you learned					1	1	4	6	4.25	955/1489	4.49	4.28	4.32	4.31	4.25
5. Did audiovisual	d the lectures contribute to what you learned d audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					0	1	5	6	4.42	394/1277	4.66	4.38	4.03	4.01	4.42
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	sions contribute to	what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	712/1279	4.55	4.19	4.17	4.14	4.20
2. Were all student	s actively encourag	ged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	478/1270	4.70	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.70
3. Did the instruct	or encourage fair a	and open discussion	3	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	793/1269	4.70	4.50	4.35	4.29	4.30
4. Were special tec	hniques successful		3	3	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	425/ 878	4.26	4.15	4.05	3.92	4.14
	Laboratory															
1. Did the lab incr	. Did the lab increase understanding of the material						0	0	0	2.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.44	****
2. Were you provide	. Were you provided with adequate background informati					0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.47	****
3. Were necessary m	Were necessary materials available for lab activities					0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.65	****
4. Did the lab inst	. Did the lab instructor provide assistance					0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.38	****
	Fr						n									
Consider Brown	G GD3	Down a set of Co. 3				ъ.		_			-				20-1	
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ty	pe			Majors	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Ī
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ART 211 0301

Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM

Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 13

Spring 2009

JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

						Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did you	a gain n	ew insights,skills	from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	485/1576	4.52	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.62
		ctor make clear th		0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	785/1576	4.44	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.38
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflect t	he expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1342	4.89	4.58	4.32	4.41	****
4. Did oth	ner eval	uations reflect th	e expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	476/1520	4.54	4.33	4.25	4.26	4.54
5. Did ass	signed r	eadings contribute	to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	2	6	4.00	850/1465	3.75	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.00
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contribu	te to what you learned	0	3	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1263/1434	3.60	3.72	4.14	4.06	3.40
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearly e	xplained	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	708/1547	4.52	4.01	4.19	4.22	4.38
8. How man	ny times	was class cancell	ed	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.23	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.00
9. How wor	ıld you	grade the overall	teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	692/1554	4.30	4.15	4.10	4.05	4.27
		Lecture															
1. Were th	ne instr	uctor's lectures w	ell prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	774/1488	4.71	4.40	4.47	4.44	4.58
2. Did the	e instru	ed in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1493	4.85	4.80	4.73	4.75	5.00	
3. Was led	cture ma	nd explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	339/1486	4.72	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.75	
4. Did the	e lectur	es contribute to w	hat you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	602/1489	4.49	4.28	4.32	4.31	4.58
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques enhan	ce your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	194/1277	4.66	4.38	4.03	4.01	4.70
		Discussio	'n														
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contribute	to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	296/1279	4.55	4.19	4.17	4.14	4.71
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively encou	raged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	458/1270	4.70	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.71
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage fai	r and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1269	4.70	4.50	4.35	4.29	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial to	echniques successf	ul	6	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 878	4.26	4.15	4.05	3.92	****
		Self Pac	ed														
1. Did se	lf-paced	system contribute	to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****
				12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	***	5.00	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were yo	Did study questions make clear the expected goal Were your contacts with the instructor helpful				0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****
			Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 9		Re	quir	ed f	or M	 ajor	 `s	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99			-			-						,			

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	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	12	_		_	
				2	0						

Course-Section: ART 211 0401 University of Maryland Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM Baltimore County Instructor: SILBERG, STEVEN

Spring 2009

Page 84

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

	DIDDING, DIDVIN	5577113 2000
Enrollment:	14	
Questionnaires:	11	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Frequencies					Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General																	
1 Did 1101	u gain ne	Genera w insights,ski	_	m thia gourgo	0	0	0	0	Λ	1	10	4.91	163/1576	4.52	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.91
					0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	313/1576		4.34	4.27	4.33	4.73
	id the instructor make clear the expected goals id the exam questions reflect the expected goals					1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	191/1342		4.58	4.32	4.41	4.89
		ations reflect			0	0	0	1	1	0	٥	4.55	464/1520	4.54	4.33	4.25	4.41	4.55
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	439/1465	3.75	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.45
	_	-		what you learned o what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.45	659/1434	3.60	3.72	4.14	4.09	4.45
		signments contr s system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.27	375/1547	4.52	4.01	4.14	4.06	4.27
		was class cance		IIIea	0	0	0	0	0	9	2		1373/1574		4.49	4.19	4.62	4.18
	-			hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	194/1554		4.15	4.10	4.02	
9. HOW WO	uia you g	grade the overa	II teac	ning effectiveness	3	U	U	U	U	۷	0	4.75	194/1554	4.30	4.15	4.10	4.05	4.75
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	orepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1488	4.71	4.40	4.47	4.44	5.00
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1493	4.85	4.80	4.73	4.75	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	172/1486	4.72	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.91
		s contribute to			0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1489	4.49	4.28	4.32	4.31	5.00
				our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	105/1277		4.38	4.03	4.01	4.90
		-	-	J														
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	179/1279	4.55	4.19	4.17	4.14	4.89
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	389/1270	4.70	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.78
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage :	fair an	d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	299/1269	4.70	4.50	4.35	4.29	4.89
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		2	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	299/ 878	4.26	4.15	4.05	3.92	4.38
				Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Re	anir	 ed f	or Ma			0	Graduat		0	Majo		6
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 1		1/6/	datt.	-u 1	J_ 1'1C	בטנ.	_	0	Graduat	_	J	1.10.) (<i>,</i> _	J
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad 1	1	Non-	-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		GC.	iici a.	_				_	onaci g.	Luu I	_	14011		3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		E1	ecti	7es				0	#### - 1	Means +	here a	re not	enous	rh
oraa.	O	3.30 1.00	5	P 0		11.11	CCCI	v CD				•	respons				_	,
				I 0		O±1	her					9	T CPFOIIS		C 5191.	cai		
				2 1		001						-						
				• -														

Course-Section: ART 212 0101 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D Instructor: BRADLEY, STEPHE

Enrollment:

84-150

Grad.

0

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

D

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

Questionnaires: 11

13

University of Maryland Page 85 Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	n Ouesti	onnaire

			Frequencies				Ins	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect						
Questions			1	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
	General																		
1. Did	you gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course		0	0	3	5	2	0	1	2.18	1572/1576	3.64	4.36	4.30	4.35	2.18
		ctor make clear				0	0	5	4	1	0	1	1.91	1576/1576	3.69	4.34	4.27	4.32	1.91
3. Did	the exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals		0	10	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1342	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.41	****
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals		0	0	4	4	2	0	1	2.09	1517/1520	3.76	4.33	4.25	4.26	2.09
5. Did	assigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learne	ed	1	2	5	2	1	0	0	1.50	1465/1465	2.58	3.86	4.12	4.09	1.50
6. Did	. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned			rned	0	1	8	1	1	0	0	1.30	1434/1434	2.01	3.72	4.14	4.06	1.30	
7. Was	7. Was the grading system clearly explained					0	0	6	3	2	0	0	1.64	1544/1547	3.14	4.01	4.19	4.22	1.64
8. How	3. How many times was class cancelled					0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1574	4.66	4.49	4.64	4.62	5.00
9. How	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness					1	0	8	1	0	1	0	1.40	1552/1554	3.12	4.15	4.10	4.05	1.40
		Lectur	e																
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared		0	0	4	3	3	0	1	2.18	1483/1488	3.93	4.40	4.47	4.44	2.18
2. Did	the instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	in the subject		0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	1402/1493	4.49	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.09
3. Was	lecture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clear	ly	0	0	5	3	2	0	1	2.00	1483/1486	3.70	4.33	4.32	4.29	2.00
4. Did	the lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned		0	0	7	3	0	0	1	1.64	1487/1489	3.48	4.28	4.32	4.31	1.64
5. Did	audiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	your understand:	ing	0	0	4	4	2	0	1	2.09	1266/1277	3.96	4.38	4.03	4.01	2.09
		Discus	sion																
1. Did	class disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learne	ed	0	0	5	2	3	1	0	2.00	1270/1279	3.67	4.19	4.17	4.14	2.00
2. Were	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participat	te	0	0	1	3	3	3	1	3.00	1208/1270	4.31	4.50	4.35	4.30	3.00
3. Did	the instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discuss:	ion	0	0	10	0	1	0	0	1.18	1269/1269	3.88	4.50	4.35	4.29	1.18
4. Were	Were special techniques successful					0	4	4	2	0	1	0	1.71	875/ 878	3.67	4.15	4.05	3.92	1.71
				I	Freque	ncy	Dis	trib	ation	n									
Crodi+a	Earned	Cum CDA		Expected Gra	-d				Do	2000				т	~			Majors	
crearrs		Cum. GPA		Expected Gra	aues 					asons	5 			Ту:	 Þe			Majors	·
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4			Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 7															
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 0			Ge	nera	l				0	Under-g	rad 1	1	Non-	major	2

Electives

Other

0

11

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 212 0201 University of Maryland Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D Instructor: YOUNG, SHANNON

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 86

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	12			
Questionnaires:	11	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

						Frequencies Instructor Cour						Course	Course Dept UMBC Level			Sect		
	Questions				NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General																	
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	2	3	0	6	3.91	1241/1576	3.64	4.36	4.30	4.35	3.91
2. Did tl	he instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	811/1576	3.69	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.36
3. Did tl	the exam questions reflect the expected goals					8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.41	5.00
4. Did of	ther evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	1	1	3	1	4	3.60	1330/1520	3.76	4.33	4.25	4.26	3.60
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	4	1	2	1	1	2	3.14	1360/1465	2.58	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.14
6. Did w	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	1	3	1	3	0	3	2.90	1392/1434	2.01	3.72	4.14	4.06	2.90
7. Was tl	he grading	g system clearl;	y expla	ined	0	0	2	0	3	2	4	3.55	1329/1547	3.14	4.01	4.19	4.22	3.55
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	957/1574	4.66	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.64
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	1	4	4	1	3.50	1303/1554	3.12	4.15	4.10	4.05	3.50
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	the instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	945/1488	3.93	4.40	4.47	4.44	4.44
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1053/1493	4.49	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.67
3. Was 1	ecture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	922/1486	3.70	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.30
		es contribute t			1	0	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	1236/1489	3.48	4.28	4.32	4.31	3.80
5. Did a	udiovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	148/1277	3.96	4.38	4.03	4.01	4.78
		Discus	gion															
1 Did c	lass discu			what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	641/1279	3 67	4 19	4.17	4 14	4.29
				d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1		4.86	307/1270		4.50		4.30	
				d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	5		491/1269	3.88	4.50			4.71
		echniques succe		a open alboabbion	4	1	0	0	2	1	3		415/ 878		4.15			4.17
				_		<u> </u>	,											
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utior	1									
Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А б		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	;	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 4						J								
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	l				0	Under-g	rad 1	1	Non-	major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0													-	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0						Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	_j h
P 0												respons				_	-	
				I O		Ot1	her				1	.0	-					
				? 0														

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

Instructor: SHEFFIELD, SAM Spring 2009

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 87

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	457/1576	3.64	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	434/1576	3.69	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1342	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	155/1520	3.76	4.33	4.25	4.26	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	1145/1547	3.14	4.01	4.19	4.22	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	1	4.09	1427/1574	4.66	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	571/1554	3.12	4.15	4.10	4.05	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1488	3.93	4.40	4.47	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	607/1493	4.49	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	191/1486	3.70	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	350/1489	3.48	4.28	4.32	4.31	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	148/1277	3.96	4.38	4.03	4.01	4.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	445/1279	3.67	4.19	4.17	4.14	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	288/1270	4.31	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1269	3.88	4.50	4.35	4.29	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 878	3.67	4.15	4.05	3.92	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 212 0401 University of Maryland Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D Baltimore County Instructor: YOUNG, SHANNON

?

0

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 13

13

JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 88

	Ouestionnaire

					-							Course	Course Dept UMBC Level					
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	w insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	1291/1576	3.64	4.36	4.30	4.35	3.85
		tor make clear			0	0	0	1	5	2	5	3.85	1270/1576	3.69	4.34	4.27	4.32	3.85
3. Did th	the exam questions reflect the expected goals					12	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1342	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.41	****
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	579/1520	3.76	4.33	4.25	4.26	4.46
				what you learned	0	4	1	1	4	2	1	3.11	1366/1465	2.58	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.11
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	2	7	1	2	0	1	1.82	1433/1434	2.01	3.72	4.14	4.06	1.82
7. Was th	e grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	1	1	6	1	4	3.46	1360/1547	3.14	4.01	4.19	4.22	3.46
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	375/1574	4.66	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.92
				hing effectiveness	3	0	0	1	6	3	0	3.20	1405/1554	3.12	4.15	4.10	4.05	3.20
		Lectur	_															
1 Wome +	ho inatan	Lectur ctor's lecture		nwanawad	2	0	0	0	2	3	1	1 10	1203/1488	3.93	4.40	4.47	4.44	4.10
		tor seem inter			3	0	0	0	2	3	5		1337/1488		4.40	4.47	4.44	4.10
				xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	7	0	2		1307/1486		4.33	4.73	4.75	3.60
		erial presente s contribute t		1	3	0	0	0	6		3		1274/1489	3.48	4.33	4.32	4.29	3.70
				our understanding	3	0	0	0	2	1 2	<i>5</i>	4.20	585/1277		4.28	4.03		4.20
5. Did au	laiovisuai	. teciniques en	nance y	our understanding	3	U	U	U	3	۷	5	4.20	505/12//	3.90	4.30	4.03	4.01	4.20
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	0	4	3.88	910/1279	3.67	4.19	4.17	4.14	3.88
2. Were a	ıll studen	ts actively en	courage	d to participate	5	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	636/1270	4.31	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.50
3. Did th	e instruc	tor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	567/1269	3.88	4.50	4.35	4.29	4.63
4. Were s	special te	chniques succe	ssful		5	3	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	603/ 878	3.67	4.15	4.05	3.92	3.80
				Frequ	iency	r Dist	trib	ution	า									
				_	-													
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 3														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	3	Non-	major	1
84-150	84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0																	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0				Ele	ecti	ves			0 #### - Means there are not			enoug	ſh					
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					9	_					
				0 0														

University of Maryland Course-Section: ART 213 0101 Title

VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D Baltimore County Spring 2009 Instructor: RIOS, JORGE

Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires:	10

Page 89 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
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	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1325/1576	4.14	4.36	4.30	4.35	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	4		1237/1576	4.16	4.34	4.27	4.32	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	2		1068/1342	3.90	4.58	4.32	4.41	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	1	3	2		1320/1520	4.20	4.33	4.25	4.26	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	708/1465	3.93	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1172/1434	3.56	3.72	4.14	4.06	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	5	3		1145/1547	3.76	4.01	4.19	4.22	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1417/1574	4.13	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1227/1554	3.82	4.15	4.10	4.05	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	3	0	5	3.89	1321/1488		4.40	4.47	4.44	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	868/1493	4.83	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	3	4		1061/1486	4.39	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1200/1489	4.20	4.28	4.32	4.31	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	429/1277	4.56	4.38	4.03	4.01	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	0	4	3.75	962/1279	3.86	4.19	4.17	4.14	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	892/1270	4.31	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	894/1269	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.29	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	187/ 878	4.14	4.15	4.05	3.92	4.60
	_	_		-	_	-	_		- ,					

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

Course-Section: ART 213 0201 Title

VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D

Instructor: MOREN, LISA

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 11 Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 90 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

				-	ncies	5	-		ructor	Course	-	UMBC		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	5	4.36	829/1576	4.14	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1138/1576	4.16	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	719/1520	4.20	4.33	4.25	4.26	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	571/1465	3.93	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1434	3.56	3.72	4.14	4.06	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	1	3	3	1	3.00	1459/1547	3.76	4.01	4.19	4.22	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	1309/1574	4.13	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	1060/1554	3.82	4.15	4.10	4.05	3.90
Lecture	0	0	0	0	-	_	0	4 11	1105/1400	4 26	4 40	4 45	4 4 4	4 11
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	Ţ	6	2		1197/1488	4.36	4.40	4.47	4.44	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	868/1493	4.83	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	763/1486	4.39	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	2		1118/1489	4.20	4.28	4.32	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	283/1277	4.56	4.38	4.03	4.01	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	938/1279	3.86	4.19	4.17	4.14	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	928/1270	4.31	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	852/1269	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.29	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	464/ 878	4.14	4.15	4.05	3.92	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.74	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	***	****	4.40	4.71	***
Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****		4.40	4.71	****
	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	****	4.73	4.69	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 326		****	4.57	4.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	ΤÜ	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	/ 326			4.03	4.43	* *
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	ı									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Ī
				P	0	Electives		responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-	_		
				2	Ο						

Course-Section: ART 213 0301 University of Maryland Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D Instructor: MAYHEW, JAMES M

Enrollment:

13

Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 91

Ouestionnaires:	11	Student Co	ourse !	Evaluation (Questionnaire
-----------------	----	------------	---------	--------------	---------------

					Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3								tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	nı gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	928/1576	4.14	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.27
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45			4.34	4.27	4.32	4.45
		uestions reflec			1	9	0	0	0	0	1		****/1342		4.58	4.32	4.41	****
		uations reflect			0	1	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	683/1520	4.20	4.33	4.25	4.26	4.40
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	9	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1465	3.93	3.86	4.12	4.09	***
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1142/1434	3.56	3.72	4.14	4.06	3.67
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	179/1547	3.76	4.01	4.19	4.22	4.82
8. How max	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	1	0	0	0	10	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.13	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.00
				hing effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1096/1554	3.82	4.15	4.10	4.05	3.86
		Lectur																
1 Word +	ho inatr	actor's lecture	propared	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	278/1488	4.36	4.40	4.47	4.44	4.89	
		ctor seem inter		2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	-,		4.80	4.73	4.75	5.00	
			xplained clearly	2	-	0		1		8		,		4.33	4.32	4.29	4.78	
		es contribute t	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	7				4.28	4.32	4.31	4.67	
				our understanding	2	-	0	0	0	2	7		,		4.38	4.03		4.78
		-	-	3														
		Discus																
				what you learned	2		0	0	3	3	3	4.00	,			4.17	4.14	4.00
		_	_	d to participate	2		0	1	0	2		4.44				4.35	4.30	4.44
				d open discussion	2		0	0	0	1	8	4.89			4.50	4.35	4.29	4.89
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		2	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	4.14	4.15	4.05	3.92	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	'arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	a			Ty	ne			Majors	•
																		,
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajors	;	0	Graduat	e	1	Majo	or	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 1	_													
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C 1	General							0	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives							0	#### - 1					jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0	Other						1	.0						

Course-Section: ART 213 0401 University of Maryland Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: MOREN, LISA

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 15

Page 92 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

	Questions						Fre	equei 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 5'1		Genera	_		0	0	-	-	0	0	•	4 10	1065/1556		4 26	4 20	4 25	4 10
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	U T	2 4	2	9		1065/1576 929/1576		4.36	4.30	4.35	4.13
		ctor make clear			1	0		-		3	8	4.27				4.27	4.32	4.27 ****
	_	uestions reflec		_	1	12	0	0	1	0	Τ		****/1342		4.58	4.32	4.41	
		uations reflect			1	1 11	0 1	0	1 1	6	5	4.38			4.33	4.25 4.12	4.26	4.38
				what you learned	0		_	0	_	1	1		1337/1465		3.86		4.09	
				o what you learned	0	10	0	0	4	0			1263/1434		3.72	4.14	4.06	3.40
		g system clearl		inea	0	3	3	•	4	0			1396/1547		4.01	4.19	4.22	3.33
		was class cand			1	0	•	0	0	12			1398/1574		4.49	4.64		4.14
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	II teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	6	3	3.86	1096/1554	3.82	4.15	4.10	4.05	3.86
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	834/1488	4.36	4.40	4.47	4.44	4.54
2. Did th	ne instruc	n the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	908/1493	4.83	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.75		
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presente	xplained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	973/1486	4.39	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.23	
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	you learned	3	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	955/1489	4.20	4.28	4.32	4.31	4.25	
5. Did au	udiovisual	l techniques en	our understanding	4	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	288/1277	4.56	4.38	4.03	4.01	4.55	
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al	ace dieci			what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	906/1279	3.86	4.19	4.17	4.14	3.89
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3		4.67	,		4.50	4.35	4.30	4.67
				d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	-	4.78			4.50	4.35		4.78
		echniques succe		a open arbeabbion	6	3	0	1	1	2	2				4.15	4.05	3.92	
1. WCIC B	эрссіаі сс	confiduct bacce	DDIGI		O	5	O	_	_	4	2	3.03	3037 070	1.11	1.13	1.05	3.72	3.03
		Self																
1. Did se	eli-paced	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****
			Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n										
Credits E	Carned	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Т∨	ре			Majors			
		Cum. GPA																
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	в 4				_									_	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nera	l				0	Under-g	rad 1	L5	Non-	major	6
84-150																		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives						0	#### -				_	ſh	
				P 0									respons	es to k	oe sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0	Other					1	.3							

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ART 214 0101

DRAWING I

15

CHAN, IRENE Y.

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 13

Page 93 JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

											Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	w insights,skil	=	this course	0	0	3	2	1	3	4	3.23	1506/1576	4.05	4.36	4.30	4.35	3.23
		tor make clear			0	0	2	3	1	3	4		1474/1576		4.34	4.27	4.32	3.31
		estions reflect			2	9	0	1	0	0	1		****/1342		4.58	4.32	4.41	****
		ations reflect			0	0	1	3	3	3	3	3.31	1427/1520	4.15	4.33	4.25	4.26	3.31
				hat you learned	1	8	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	1448/1465	3.50	3.86	4.12	4.09	2.50
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contri	ibute to	what you learned	0 E	2	4	3	1	0	3	2.55	1414/1434	3.11	3.72	4.14	4.06	2.55
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y explai	ned -	1	0	1	2	4	2	3	3.33	1396/1547	3.67	4.01	4.19	4.22	3.33
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	11	1	4.08	1431/1574	4.35	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.08
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overal	ll teach	ning effectivenes	s 2	1	1	1	5	3	0	3.00	1448/1554	3.92	4.15	4.10	4.05	3.00
		Lecture																
		ctor's lectures			3	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	1233/1488	4.50	4.40	4.47	4.44	4.00
		tor seem intere			3	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	1337/1493	4.65	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.30
				plained clearly	3	0	1	3	0	3	3	3.40	1362/1486	4.20	4.33	4.32	4.29	3.40
		es contribute to	_		3	0	1	2	2	2	3	3.40	1345/1489	4.14	4.28	4.32	4.31	3.40
5. Did au	diovisual	. techniques enh	nance yo	our understanding	3	2	5	0	0	2	1	2.25	1257/1277	3.20	4.38	4.03	4.01	2.25
		Discuss																
				hat you learned	4	0	5	0	1	0	3		1244/1279		4.19	4.17	4.14	
				l to participate	4	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	897/1270	4.46	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.11
				l open discussion	4	0	2	1	1	1	4		1131/1269	4.22	4.50	4.35	4.29	3.44
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful		4	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	4.00	4.15	4.05	3.92	****
				Fre	quency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grade:	des Reasons								Ty	pe			Majors	5
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors							1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5		100	quii.	- Cu - L	J_ 11	ajori	5	-	Gradade	_	J	11000	, <u> </u>	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	3	Non-	major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0								-	J		-		5	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Electives						0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoue	ah
				P 0	Electives						respons					•		
				I O		Ot:	her					9			3			
				? 0			-											
				• •														

University of Maryland Page 94
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

5

	Ouestionnaire

Course-Section: ART 214 0201

DRAWING I

NOHE, TIM

13

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

					Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1 Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	Ο	1	7	4.88	187/1576	4.05	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.88
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1576		4.34	4.27	4.32	5.00
		estions reflec			0	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	240/1342		4.58	4.32	4.41	4.80
	_	ations reflect		_	0	2	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520		4.33	4.25	4.26	5.00
				what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	366/1465		3.86	4.12	4.09	4.50
	_	_		o what you learned	1	4	1	0	0	0	2		1142/1434		3.72	4.14	4.06	3.67
		g system clearl			0	2	0	0	3	0	3		1041/1547	3.67	4.01	4.19	4.22	4.00
		was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	972/1574		4.49	4.64	4.62	4.63
				hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	_	4.83	146/1554			4.10	4.05	4.83
J. 11011 110	, u_u _ , o u _	jidas ons overa		11113 01100011011000	_	ŭ	ŭ	Ü	Ü	_		1.05	110, 1001	3.72	1.15	1.10	1.00	1.05
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1488	4.50	4.40	4.47	4.44	5.00		
2. Did th	e instruc	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1493	4.65	4.80	4.73	4.75	5.00		
3. Was le	cture mat	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1486	4.20	4.33	4.32	4.29	5.00		
4. Did th	e lecture	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	228/1489	4.14	4.28	4.32	4.31	4.88		
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	1	0	2	0	0	5	4.14	623/1277	3.20	4.38	4.03	4.01	4.14
		Discus																
				what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1279	3.78	4.19	4.17	4.14	5.00
				d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	355/1270	4.46	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.80
				d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1269	4.22	4.50	4.35	4.29	5.00
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		4	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.15	4.05	3.92	4.00
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	5 5	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				1	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				- A		O+1						_						

Other

I

?

0

0

Course-Section: ART 220 0101 Title ART HISTORY I

Title ART HISTORY I Instructor: FELDMAN, JOAN

Enrollment: 121 Questionnaires: 68 Spring 2009
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 95 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	5	13	45	4.43	757/1576	4.43	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	23	40	4.51			4.34	4.27	4.32	4.51
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	12	50	4.63			4.58	4.32	4.41	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	2	8	24	28	4.26	-, -		4.33	4.25	4.26	4.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	3	2	10	14	32	4.15			3.86	4.12	4.09	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	5	12	22	24	3.89	1009/1434	3.89	3.72	4.14	4.06	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	11	26	31	4.29	794/1547		4.01	4.19	4.22	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	8	59	4.88	508/1574	4.88	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	3	14	28	14	3.90	1067/1554	3.90	4.15	4.10	4.05	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	20	45	4.63	722/1488	4.63	4.40	4.47	4.44	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	61	4.91	501/1493	4.91	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	3	21	39	4.49		4.49	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	6	10	48	4.60	579/1489	4.60	4.28	4.32	4.31	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	2	0	6	11	38	4.46	356/1277	4.46	4.38	4.03	4.01	4.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	37	0	3	3	5	7	13	3.77	,		4.19	4.17	4.14	3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	37	0	1	4	5	9	12		1014/1270		4.50	4.35	4.30	3.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	37	0	1	3	8	7	12		1010/1269		4.50	4.35	4.29	3.84
4. Were special techniques successful	37	25	2	0	4	0	0	2.33	****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	3.92	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	66	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	67	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	67	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.65	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	66	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.78	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	67	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	,		5.00	4.69	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	67	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	, . –		****	4.64	4.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,		5.00	4.61	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	67	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.21	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	67	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 52		****	4.48	4.74	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	67	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48		****	4.40	4.71	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	67	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 44		****	4.73	4.69	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	67	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 45		****	4.57	4.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	67	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.43	****
Self Paced	. -	•	•	_	_	•	•	2 22			F 00	4	F 00	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	67	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 40		5.00	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00			5.00	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	67 67	0	0	0	1 1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35 ****/ 28		5.00 5.00	4.67 4.78	5.00 5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	67	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 382		****	4.78	4.39	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0 /	U	U	U	т	U	U	3.00	/ 302			4.00	4.33	

Course-Section: ART 220 0101
Title ART HISTORY I
Instructor: FELDMAN, JOAN
Enrollment: 121

Questionnaires: 68

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 95 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	 А	35	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	27
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	В	22						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	9	C	5	General	10	Under-grad	68	Non-major	41
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	16	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	30	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 221 0101
Title ART HISTORY II

Title ART HISTORY II Instructor: OTTESEN, BODIL

Enrollment: 104
Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 96 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	8	19	22	4.29	916/1576	4.29	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	4	10	15	19		1237/1576	3.90	4.34	4.30	4.33	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	4	5	15	23	4.08	944/1342	4.08	4.58	4.32	4.41	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	8	0	4	8	14	15		1078/1520	3.98	4.33	4.25	4.26	3.98
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	1	6	12	28	4.35	554/1465	4.35	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	4	2	4	6	16	17	3.93	966/1434	3.93	3.72	4.14	4.06	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	2	3	8	17			1093/1547	3.96	4.01	4.19	4.22	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	10	39	4.80	683/1574	4.80	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	2	11	19	6	3.76	1159/1554	3.76	4.15	4.10	4.05	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	4	15	29	4.52	846/1488	4.52	4.40	4.47	4.44	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	7	40	4.81	784/1493	4.81	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	2	8	16	21		1054/1486	4.13	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	2	15	28	4.38	845/1489	4.38	4.28	4.32	4.31	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	2	4	2	6	32	4.35	455/1277	4.35	4.38	4.03	4.01	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	5	2	8	3	13		1047/1279	3.55	4.19	4.17	4.14	3.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	4	1	11	5	10		1133/1270	3.52	4.50	4.35	4.30	3.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	2	4	8	7	9		1098/1269	3.57	4.50	4.35	4.29	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	21	24	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	3.92	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	50	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.65	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	50	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.78	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.21	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.74	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	50	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.71	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	50	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.69	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	50	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	50	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	***	4.03	4.43	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	***	****	4.08	4.39	****

Course-Section: ART 221 0101
Title ART HISTORY II
Instructor: OTTESEN, BODIL
Enrollment: 104

Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 96 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	26
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	27						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	9	Under-grad	52	Non-major	26
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	29	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 305 0101 University of Maryland
Title FILM I: MOVING IMAGES Baltimore County

Instructor: WORDEN, FRED

Enrollment: 11
Ouestionnaires: 9

Spring 2009
Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Instructor Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 7 4.78 277/1576 4.78 4.36 4.30 4.30 4.78 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 166/1576 4.89 4.34 4.27 4.28 4.89 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 2 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1342 5.00 4.58 4.32 4.30 5.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 1 0 0 0 7 4.50 511/1520 4.50 4.33 4.25 4.25 4.50 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 0 2 6 4.33 571/1465 4.33 3.86 4.12 4.09 4.33 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 1 0 7 4.33 594/1434 4.33 3.72 4.14 4.15 4.337. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 135/1547 4.89 4.01 4.19 4.21 4.89 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 5 4 4.44 1152/1574 4.44 4.49 4.64 4.61 4.44 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1554 5.00 4.15 4.10 4.09 5.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 293/1488 4.88 4.40 4.47 4.47 4.88 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1493 5.00 4.80 4.73 4.70 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 201/1486 4.88 4.33 4.32 4.32 4.88 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1/1489 5.00 4.28 4.32 4.34 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1 0 0 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1277 5.00 4.38 4.03 4.11 5.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1279 5.00 4.19 4.17 4.20 5.00 0 1/1270 5.00 4.50 4.35 4.42 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.50 4.35 4.41 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 3 0 0 1 0 1 4 4.33 322/ 878 4.33 4.15 4.05 4.09 4.33

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ART 314 0101

DRAWING II

9

CHAN, IRENE Y.

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

Page 98 JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ouestions		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this of	course	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1042/1576	4.17	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected of	goals	1	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1392/1576	3.50	4.34	4.27	4.28	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected	goals	1	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1209/1342	3.50	4.58	4.32	4.30	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected of	goals	1	0	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	1418/1520	3.33	4.33	4.25	4.25	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you	ı learned	1	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1465	****	3.86	4.12	4.09	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what y	you learned	1	0	2	1	1	2	0	2.50	1416/1434	2.50	3.72	4.14	4.15	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		1	0	3	0	0	2	1	2.67	1506/1547	2.67	4.01	4.19	4.21	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled		2	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching eff	fectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1303/1554	3.50	4.15	4.10	4.09	3.50
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	f	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1048/1488	4.33	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the su	_	1	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	1321/1493	4.33	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained		1	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1330/1486	3.50	4.33	4.32	4.32	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you lear		1	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1363/1489	3.33	4.28	4.32	4.34	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your unde	erstanding	1	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	463/1277	4.33	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.33
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you		2	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to par		2	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	855/1270	4.20	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open of	discussion	2	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	852/1269	4.20	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful		2	1	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	862/ 878	2.00	4.15	4.05	4.09	2.00
	Frequ	lency	Dist	tribu	ıtior	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expec	cted Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 F	 A 3		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r)r	4
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 E	3 2												_		
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 0	2 1		Ger	neral	L				4	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	3
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1	0									_				-	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F	₹ 0	Electives							0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	јh
I	P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
J	I 0		Oth	ner					2	-					
3	? 0														

Course-Section: ART 315 0101 University of Maryland Page 99
Title VIDEO I Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Instructor: GRABILL, VIN Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 12

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Questionnaires: 10

						Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	2	1	5	2	3.70	1366/1576	3.70	4.36	4.30	4.30	3.70
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1076/1576	4.10	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.10
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	770/1342	4.33	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.33
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	994/1520	4.10	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.10
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	3	1	3.11	1366/1465	3.11	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.11
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	2	2	0	4	0	1	2.71	1404/1434	2.71	3.72	4.14	4.15	2.71
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1159/1547	3.89	4.01	4.19	4.21	3.89
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		1	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1417/1574	4.11	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.11
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	1	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1152/1554	3.78	4.15	4.10	4.09	3.78
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1111/1488	4.25	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.25
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1101/1493		4.80	4.73	4.70	4.63
	Was lecture material presented and explained clear						0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1207/1486	3.88	4.33	4.32	4.32	3.88
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						2	0	1	3	2		1352/1489		4.28	4.32	4.34	3.38
5. Did au	diovisua	our understanding	2	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	385/1277	4.43	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.43		
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	745/1279	4.14	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.14
				d to participate	3	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	881/1270		4.50	4.35	4.42	4.14
				d open discussion	3	0	1	0	1	3	2		1051/1269		4.50	4.35	4.41	3.71
		echniques succe			3	5	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 878	***	4.15	4.05	4.09	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	tribu	ıtioı	n									
G		G GD3		The second of the second				D -					m.				No	
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades					asons	3 			Ту	pe 			Majors	;
00-27							quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors		0	Graduat	е	1	Majo	r	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99																
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				1	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives						0	#### -				_	jh	
				P 0								respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt		
				I 0	Other							7						

? 0

Course-Section: ART 321 0101 University of Maryland Title 19TH CENTURY ART Instructor: SMALLS, JAMES

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 100

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 44 Questionnaires: 27 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	3 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2 2 2 2 2 2	0 0 0 1 2	0 0 0 2 5	0 0 0 2 2 4	1 5 3 5 4 4	8 9 4 5 4 6	16 11 18 10 8	3.35	500/1576 958/1576 480/1342 1236/1520 1313/1465 1257/1434	4.24 4.60 3.79 3.35	4.36 4.34 4.58 4.33 3.86 3.72	4.30 4.27 4.32 4.25 4.12 4.14	4.30 4.28 4.30 4.25 4.09 4.15	4.60 4.24 4.60 3.79 3.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2 2 4	1 0 1	2 0 0	1 2 1	0 1 1	9 18 12	12 4	4.17 3.96	924/1547 1484/1574 742/1554	4.17 3.96	4.01 4.49	4.19 4.64 4.10	4.21 4.61 4.09	4.17
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 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	2 2 2 2 2	0 0 0 0 3	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 1 1	2 0 5 2 2	23 25 19 22 18	4.92 5.00 4.72 4.84 4.64	,	5.00 4.72 4.84	4.40 4.80 4.33 4.28 4.38	4.47 4.73 4.32 4.32 4.03	4.47 4.70 4.32 4.34 4.11	4.84
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	12 12 12 11	0 0 0 12	2 1 1 0	2 0 1 0	2 2 2 1	3 5 4 0	6 7 7 3	4.13 4.00	1022/1279 887/1270 928/1269 ****/ 878	4.13	4.19 4.50 4.50 4.15	4.17 4.35 4.35 4.05	4.20 4.42 4.41 4.09	3.60 4.13 4.00 ***
Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	***	****	4.35	4.32	****
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria Self Paced	26 26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 5.00	****/ 52 ****/ 48	* * * * * * *	* * * * * * * *	4.48 4.40	4.37	* * * * * * * *
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	***
Frequ Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	ency	DIS	LIDU		ı asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27		Ger	uire quire neral ectiv	_	or Ma	ajor		3 3 1 8	Graduat Under-g #### - : respons	rad 2 Means t		re not	major enoug	12 15

Course-Section: ART 323 0101

Title 20TH CENTURY ART

Instructor: SMALLS, JAMES

Enrollment: 35

Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 101 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Tngt	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	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	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	289/1576	4.65	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	785/1576	4.53	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	467/1342	4.75	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	8	8	4.00	1041/1520	4.25	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	6	7	3	3.29	1331/1465	3.83	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	1	9	6	3.71	1117/1434	4.04	3.72	4.14	4.15	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	8	7	3.86	1182/1547	4.20	4.01	4.19	4.21	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	4	1	14	1	3.60	1550/1574	3.93	4.49	4.64	4.61	3.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	14	3	4.11	860/1554	4.31	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.11
T. codecour														
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	505/1488	4.77	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1493	4.77	4.40	4.73	4.47	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	3	14	4.55	619/1486	4.95	4.33	4.73	4.70	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	251/1489	4.87	4.33	4.32	4.34	4.85
-	2	2	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	176/1277		4.28	4.32		4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	U	U	1	3	14	4./2	1/6/12//	4.84	4.38	4.03	4.11	4./2
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	802/1279	3.78	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	2	1	11	4.40	736/1270	4.07	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	2	1	6	6	4.07	915/1269	4.10	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	7	13	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	4.09	****
T alassa kassa														
Laboratory	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	1	г оо	++++/ 040	++++	++++	4 2 5	4 20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21 21	0	0	0	0	0	1 1		****/ 240 ****/ 379	****	****	4.35	4.32 4.17	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	***/ 3/9			4.20	4.17	
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.12	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2 00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3. Was the instructor available for consultation		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****			****
	21	-	-	-	-	_	U		,	****	****	4.73	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,			4.57	4.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****
- *														

Course-Section: ART 323 0101
Title 20TH CENTURY ART
Instructor: SMALLS, JAMES

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 101 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 35
Questionnaires: 22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	-			
				?	4						

Course-Section: ART 323 0201 Title

20TH CENTURY ART

Instructor: FAGAN, ROBERT

Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 102 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2			5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean			
	General														
	insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	7	18		595/1576			4.30	4.30	4.54
	make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	22	4.68	378/1576			4.27	4.28	4.68
	tions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	185/1342		4.58	4.32	4.30	4.89
	ions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	2	7		4.50			4.33		4.25	4.50
	ings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	2	./		4.37			3.86		4.09	4.37
	nments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3				574/1434				4.15	4.36
8. How many times was	ystem clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	13 20	15 7		492/1547 1324/1574			4.19	4.21 4.61	4.54
	de the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	10			395/1554				4.01	
9. How would you grad	de the overall teaching effectiveness	5	U	U	U	1	10	13	4.50	395/1554	4.31	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.50
	Lecture														
1. Were the instructo	or's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	22	4.79	442/1488	4.77	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.79
2. Did the instructor	seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	582/1493	4.95	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.89
3. Was lecture mater:	ial presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	22	4.79	298/1486	4.67	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.79
	contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3			217/1489			4.32	4.34	
5. Did audiovisual to	echniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	42/1277	4.84	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.96
	P														
1 5' 1 1 1'	Discussion	1.0	0	0	-	_	_	_	2 56	1000/1000	2 50	4 10	4 1 1	4 00	2 56
	ions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	1	5	2			1038/1279			4.17		
	actively encouraged to participate encourage fair and open discussion	13	0 0	1	2 1	4 5	2 1	7		1054/1270 894/1269	4.07 4.10	4.50	4.35	$4.42 \\ 4.41$	3.75
4. Were special techn		13	15	0	0	0	1			****/ 878			4.35	4.41	
4. Were special tecin	iiques successiui	13	15	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	/ 6/6		4.15	4.05	4.09	
	Laboratory														
2. Were you provided	with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****
	Seminar														
	available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****
5. Were criteria for	grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.12	****
	Field Work														
1 Did field experies	nce contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****
	nderstand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****
	available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	
5. Nab che imperacce	a warange for bombaroadisi		Ū	Ū	Ū	Ü	Ū	_	3.00	, 11			1.75	1.05	
	Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced sys	stem contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study question	2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal				0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts	s with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****
	Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned				Rea	ason	.s			Ty	pe			Majors		
	0.00.00.00														

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	10	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	21
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	22	-	_		
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 325 0101

Title HIST OF FILM & VIDEO

Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN

Enrollment: 65
Questionnaires: 44

, JOHN Spring 2009

Page 103 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean			Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	3	7	6	12	14	3 64	1392/1576	3 64	4 36	4.30	4.30	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	4	4	13	15	6		1456/1576	3.36	4.34	4.27	4.28	3.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	6	4	14	9	8		1277/1342	3.22	4.58	4.32	4.30	3.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	30	2	1	3	2	2		****/1520	****	4.33	4.25	4.25	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	2	2	6	8	19	4.08	808/1465	4.08	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	28	2	1	4	2	3	3.25	1313/1434	3.25	3.72	4.14	4.15	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	1	2	5	12	19	4.18	916/1547	4.18	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	0	0	16	21		1033/1574		4.49	4.64	4.61	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	1	4	5	17	8	3.77	1152/1554	3.77	4.15	4.10	4.09	3.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	4	5	30	4.57	786/1488	4.57	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	1	6	32		1017/1493	4.70	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	4	7	13	14		1225/1486	3.83	4.33	4.32	4.32	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	3	2	8	10	16		1205/1489	3.87	4.28	4.32	4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	3	0	2	4	31	4.50	309/1277	4.50	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	7	3	4	6	6		1182/1279	3.04	4.19	4.17	4.20	3.04
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	9	1	2	5	8		1201/1270	3.08	4.50	4.35	4.42	3.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19 20	0	8	2 1	3 0	4	8		1207/1269	3.08 ****	4.50	4.35	4.41	3.08
4. Were special techniques successful	20	20	U	1	U	0	3	4.25	****/ 878		4.15	4.05	4.09	
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	****	4.51	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.17	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	42	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 85	***	5.00	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	42	1 1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42 42	1	0	0	0	0	1 1		****/ 72 ****/ 80	****	****	4.64 4.61	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.12	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	12	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	, 313		3.00	1.01	1,12	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	,	****	****	4.40	3.92	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	42	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	42	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	42	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	***	****	4.08	4.24	****

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Course-Section: ART 325 0101

Title HIST OF FILM & VIDEO Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN

Instructor: STURE Enrollment: 65

Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 103 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits H	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	13	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C	9	General	11	Under-grad	44	Non-major	28
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	-			
				?	3						

Course-Section: ART 327 0101 University of Maryland Title CONT DIRECTIONS IN PHO Baltimore County

Instructor: DURANT, MARK

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 38

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 104

JUL 2, 2009

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	9	0	0	1	3	9	16	4.38	818/1576	4.38	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	0	1	2	9	17	4.45	698/1576	4.45	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	22	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	****/1342	****	4.58	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	2	0	0	2	7	18	4.59	406/1520	4.59	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	187/1465	4.79	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	6	19	4.63	305/1434	4.63	3.72	4.14	4.15	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	2	1	1	4	10	9	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	0	0	0	0	12	16	4.57	1025/1574	4.57	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	246/1554	4.68	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	324/1488	4.86	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	223/1493		4.80	4.73	4.70	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	6	22	4.79	298/1486	4.79	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	286/1489	4.82	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	1	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	118/1277	4.85	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.85
Discussion			•	•		_				4 00			4 00	4 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	3	-7	11	4.38	568/1279		4.19	4.17	4.20	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	401/1270	4.76	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	386/1269	4.81	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.81
4. Were special techniques successful	17	15	0	U	Ü	2	4	4.67	****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	4.09	***
From	onati	Diat	-rih	1+ i or	_									

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	38	Non-major	25
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	3						

Course-Section: ART 331 0101
Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I
Instructor: BELL, KATHRYN L

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 105 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	8		
Questionnaires:	6	Student Course Evaluation	n Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1 67	A1F/1F76	4 40	1 20	1 20	4 20	1 67
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0		4	4.67	415/1576	4.49	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	201/1576	4.75	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	Τ.	4.50	583/1342		4.58	4.32	4.30	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	179/1520		4.33	4.25	4.25	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	Τ	Τ	4.50	366/1465	3.88	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.50
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	527/1547	4.56	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	2	2		1367/1574		4.49	4.64	4.61	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	623/1554	4.44	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.33
Lecture														
	0	0	0	Λ	0	1	_	4.83	355/1488	4.92	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.83
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	-	0	-	0	0	1	5		,					
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	734/1493	4.92	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	271/1486	4.78	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	309/1489	4.75	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	215/1277	4.53	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	Λ	0	Λ	Ω	1	5	4.83	204/1279	4.67	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1270	4.92	4.50	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	353/1269	4.75	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.83
		2	0	0	0	7	2	4.50	221/ 878			4.35		
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	U	U	U	۷	۷	4.50	ZZI/ 8/8	4.42	4.15	4.05	4.09	4.50
Frequ	iencv	r Dist	rib	ıt i oı	n									

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

University of Maryland Page 106
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ART 331 0201

13

GRAPHIC DESIGN I

BELL, KATHRYN L

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 13

					Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4								tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Die	d vou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	n this course	0	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	893/1576	4.49	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.31
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	392/1576	4.75	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.67
		uestions reflec			0	10	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1342	4.50	4.58	4.32	4.30	***
		uations reflect			0	1	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	511/1520	4.67	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.50
				what you learned	0	9	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1337/1465	3.88	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.25
6. Dic	d written as	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1434	****	3.72	4.14	4.15	***
7. Was	s the gradin	g system clearl	y explai	ined	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	399/1547	4.56	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.62
8. Hov	w many times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	1	9	2	4.08	1431/1574	4.14	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.08
9. Hov	w would you	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	363/1554	4.44	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.55
		Lectur																
		uctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1488		4.40	4.47	4.47	5.00
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1493	4.92	4.80	4.73	4.70	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	325/1486	4.78	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.77
		es contribute to			0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	461/1489	4.75	4.28	4.32		4.69
5. Dic	d audiovisua	ıl techniques enl	hance yo	our understanding	0	0	1	0	2	0	10	4.38	421/1277	4.53	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.38
		Discus								_								
				what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	445/1279	4.67		4.17	4.20	4.50
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2		4.83	326/1270	4.92	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.83
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	535/1269	4.75	4.50	4.35	4.41	
4. Wei	re special t	echniques succe	sstul		1	3	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	322/ 878	4.42	4.15	4.05	4.09	4.33
				Freq		. Dia	taib.	.+ :	_									
				rredi	ienc)	DIS	CLID	10101	.1									
Credit	ts Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons							Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	 7 1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quire		or Ma			0	Graduat	 _	0	Majo	 r	11
28-55		1.00-1.99	0	В 4		110	1011			.,	_	•	OZ dadao	_	•		-	
56-83		2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nera:	L				0	Under-q	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	2
84-15		3.00-3.49	3	D 0									5				3	
Grad.		3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoue	1h
				P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Ot1	her				1	.3	-					
				? 3														

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 107

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: ART 332 0101 University of Maryland Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II Instructor: ROSENBERG, ARI

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

15

			Fre	equer	ncies	2		Tnat	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.evel	Sect
Ouestions	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	7	4.42	772/1576	4.57	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	939/1576	4.59	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	835/1342	4.25	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	339/1520	4.71	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1004/1465	4.19	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1434	****	3.72	4.14	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	673/1547	4.32	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1324/1574	4.20	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	924/1554	4.27	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.00
T a selection														
Lecture	0	0	•	-	0	_	0	4 50	EE 4 / 1 4 0 0	4 60	4 40	4 45	4 45	4 50
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	Τ	0	2	9	4.58	774/1488	4.67	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	501/1493	4.96	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	1	10	4.58	584/1486	4.71	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	696/1489	4.71	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	356/1277	4.73	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	510/1279	4.66	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	505/1270	4.77	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	299/1269	4.94	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	631/ 878	3.75	4.15	4.05	4.09	3.75
**************************************	_	_	_		-	_	_		,	- /				
Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	ı									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	 5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				2	1						

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 108

JUL 2, 2009

Course-Section: ART 332 0201 University of Maryland Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II Instructor: ROSENBERG ART

Instructor:	ROSENBERG, ARI			pring		_								-	Job IRE	3R3029
Enrollment: Questionnaires	14 : 14	Student Cou	rse	Evalı	atio	on Q	uest	ionn	aire	<u>:</u>						
					Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General Did you gain new insights,skills from this course															
1. Did you gair	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course				0	0	1	2	11	4.71	347/1576	4.57	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.71
2. Did the ins	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course Did the instructor make clear the expected goals			0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	121/1576	4.59	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.93
3. Did the exam	m questions reflect the expe	cted goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1342	4.25	4.58	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did other e	valuations reflect the expec	ted goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	249/1520	4.71	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.75
5. Did assigned	d readings contribute to wha	t you learned	0	8	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	366/1465	4.19	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.50
6. Did written	assignments contribute to w	nat you learned	0	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1434	***	3.72	4.14	4.15	****
7. Was the grad	ding system clearly explaine	f	0	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	882/1547	4.32	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.21
8. How many ti	mes was class cancelled		0	0	Ω	Ω	Ω	12	2	4.14	1398/1574	4.20	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.14

How many times was class cancelled	Ü	0	0	0	U	12	2	4.14	1398/1574	4.20	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.14	
How would you grade the overall teaching effectivene	ss 1	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	371/1554	4.27	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.54	

	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	505/1488	4.67	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.75
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1493	4.96	4.80	4.73	4.70	5.00
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	241/1486	4.71	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.83
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	174/1489	4.71	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.92
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1277	4.73	4.38	4.03	4.11	5.00

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	184/1279	4.66	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	288/1270	4.77	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1269	4.94	4.50	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 878	3.75	4.15	4.05	4.09	****

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14			
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	5									
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	0			
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0									
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	are not enough	n				
				P	0			responses to	responses to be significant					
				I	0	Other	12							
				?	0									

University of Maryland GRAPHIC DESIGN III Baltimore County

0

Course-Section: ART 333 0201

12

CAMPBELL, SUSAN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

Page 109 JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

				Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect				
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1 Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	527/1576	4.61	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals				1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	434/1576	4.59	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals				0	2	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	369/1342		4.58	4.32	4.30	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals					0	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	281/1520	4.73	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned					0	1	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	546/1465	4.23	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned					0	9	0	1	0	1	1		1142/1434		3.72	4.14	4.15	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained						0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	985/1547	4.04	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled					0	0	0	0	0	11	1		1431/1574		4.49	4.64	4.61	4.08
	-			hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	3	4		871/1554			4.10	4.09	4.10
J. 110W WO	uiu you s	grade the overa	II ccac	ning circuiteness	2	Ü	O	O	3	3	-	1.10	07171331	1.11	1.13	1.10	1.05	1.10
		Lectur	_															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject				1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	708/1488	4.60	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	784/1493	4.80	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.82
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	749/1486	4.51	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	754/1489	4.45	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.45	
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	7	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	943/1277	3.73	4.38	4.03	4.11	3.67
		Discus	sion															
1 Did cla	ass disco			what you learned	6	0	0	Ο	1	3	2	4.17	732/1279	4.19	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.17
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	784/1270	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.33
				d open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	644/1269	4.47	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.50
		echniques succe		a open arbeabbion	6	1	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	464/ 878		4.15	4.05	4.09	4.00
1	poorar o	Joinit dace	00141		ŭ	_	Ü	_	Ü	-	_	1.00	101, 0,0	1.50	1115	1.05	1.05	1.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 A 8		 Ra	 mir		 от М	ajor	 z	0	Graduat		0	Majo		11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 2		1/6	darr.	Lu I	OT M	، ۲۰۰۱	ی	U	Graduat	_	U	ria JC	/±	11
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Ge:	nera:	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	.2	Non-	-major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		GE.	иста.	_				U	onder -g	Luu 1	. 4	11011-	ma JUL	_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	Б 0 F 0		. רק	ectiv	700				0	#### _ :	Maana +	hore -	re not	enous	rh
Ji au.	U	3.30-4.00	J	P 0		51,	CCLI	v CD				U		## - Means there are not enou sponses to be significant				111
				I 0		O+1	her				1	2	T CPFOIIP	CD LO L	, a191.	ııı ıcaı.		
				1 0		UL.	TICI					. 4						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ART 333 0301

13

GRAPHIC DESIGN III

CAMPBELL, SUSAN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 11

Page 110 JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Cours	se Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------------	---------------	---------------

							Fre	eque:	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General																	
1. Did yo	u qain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	457/1576	4.61	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.64
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	555/1576	4.59	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.55
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	333/1342	4.71	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.73
	_	ations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	281/1520	4.73	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.73
				what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	803/1465	4.23	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.09
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	270/1434	4.17	3.72	4.14	4.15	4.67
7. Was th	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	1041/1547	4.04	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.00
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	11	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.04	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	849/1554	4.11	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.13
		Lectur	e															
1 Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture		prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	810/1488	4.60	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.56
		tor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	2	7		868/1493	4.80	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.78
				xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	619/1486	4.51	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.56
		es contribute t		1	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	766/1489	4.45	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.44
				our understanding	2	4	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	856/1277		4.38	4.03		3.80
		Discus	aion															
1 Did al				what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.22	689/1279	4.19	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.22
				d to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	7		505/1279	4.19	4.19	4.17	4.42	4.22
		_	_	d to participate d open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	694/1269	4.47	4.50	4.35		4.44
		chniques succe		a open arscussion	2	4	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	187/ 878		4.15	4.05	4.41	4.60
4. were s	peciai te	echniques succe	SSLUI		2	4	U	U	U	2	3	4.60	18// 8/8	4.30	4.15	4.05	4.09	4.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		 Re	 quir		 or M	aior		0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 6		ICC.	datt	- L	OI III	الماري	_	0	Graduat	_	J	11000	-	10
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	1	Non-	major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		001	c. u.	-				•	011461 9	1	_	1,011	2	_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		E1	ecti	7es				0	#### -	Means +	here a	re not	enouc	rh
JI aa.	0	3.30 1.00	1	P 0		11.1	CCLI	v CD				0	respons				_	,
				I 0		O+1	her					9	TCBPOHB		c bigi	cai.		
				± 0		O C.	LICI					,						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 111 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	7	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

Course-Section: ART 334 0101

10

GRAPHIC DESIGN IV

COATES, JOSEPH

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1299/1576	3.46	4.36	4.30	4.30	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	1	2		1275/1576		4.34	4.27	4.28	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	1	0	0		****/1342		4.58	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	2	0	1	3.00	1466/1520	3.14	4.33	4.25	4.25	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1465	2.50	3.86	4.12	4.09	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1434	****	3.72	4.14	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	1497/1547	2.55	4.01	4.19	4.21	2.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1532/1574	3.64	4.49	4.64	4.61	3.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1350/1554	2.85	4.15	4.10	4.09	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	1	0	0		1484/1488		4.40	4.47	4.47	2.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	4.67	4.80	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	0	1	0		1471/1486	2.75	4.33	4.32	4.32	2.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1480/1489	2.36	4.28	4.32	4.34	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	Λ	0	1	1	Λ	Λ	2 50	1249/1279	2.83	4.19	4.17	4.20	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1270	4.71	4.50	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	4.58	4.50	4.35	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 878		4.15	4.05	4.09	****
T. METE SPECIAL CECHILIQUES SUCCESSIUL	3	1	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	/ 6/6	3.33	±.13	4.05	4.09	
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
- 4	- 1													

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	2
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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	6	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: ART 334 0201 University of Maryland Page 112
Title GRAPHIC DESIGN IV Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Instructor: COATES, JOSEPH Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 12

St	udent	Course	Evaluation	Ouestio	nnaire

Questionnaires: 11

		Question	a		MB	NA	Fre	_	ncies	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean			
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	1	4	1	3	2	3.09	1529/1576	3.46	4.36	4.30	4.30	3.09
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	3	3	4	1	3.27	1480/1576	3.55	4.34	4.27	4.28	3.27
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1342	****	4.58	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	2	1	2	4	2	3.27	1433/1520	3.14	4.33	4.25	4.25	3.27
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	7	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	1448/1465	2.50	3.86	4.12	4.09	2.50
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	8	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1434	****	3.72	4.14	4.15	****
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	1	5	1	0	4	0	2.30	1530/1547	2.55	4.01	4.19	4.21	2.30
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	1	4	6	0	3.45	1559/1574	3.64	4.49	4.64	4.61	3.45
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	thing effectiveness	1	0	2	3	5	0	0	2.30	1539/1554	2.85	4.15	4.10	4.09	2.30
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instr	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	3	0	1	2	3	2	0	2.75	1470/1488	2.38	4.40	4.47	4.47	2.75
		ctor seem inter			2	0	1	0	0	2	6		1321/1493		4.80	4.73	4.70	4.33
				explained clearly	3	0	1		3	3	0	3.00	1421/1486	2.75	4.33	4.32	4.32	3.00
		es contribute t			3	1	2	0	3	2	0	2.71	1458/1489	2.36	4.28	4.32	4.34	2.71
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	5	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1267/1277	2.00	4.38	4.03	4.11	2.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1161/1279	2.83	4.19	4.17	4.20	3.17
				ed to participate	4	0	0	0	2	0	5		716/1270		4.50	4.35	4.42	4.43
				nd open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	1	3		870/1269			4.35	4.41	4.17
		echniques succe			6	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	755/ 878		4.15		4.09	3.33
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
				-														
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту:	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А 6		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors		0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her				1	.0						

Course-Section: ART 341 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO ANIMATION Baltimore County Instructor: DYER, ERIC G Spring 2009

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

11

University of Maryland Page 113
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ctudont	Conrac	Production	Ouestionnaire
bludent	COULSE	Evaluation	Ouescionnaire

					Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			 '															
1 544		General w insights,skil	_		0	0	0	0	2	1	1	1 12	1073/1576	4.51	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.13
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	3 1	4	3	4.13	939/1576		4.34	4.27	4.28	4.13
		lestions reflect			0	6	0	1	0	0	1		1209/1342		4.58	4.32	4.20	3.50
		ations reflect			0	2	0	0	0	2	4		339/1520		4.33	4.25	4.25	4.67
				what you learned	0	0	2	2	1	0	3		1386/1465		3.86	4.12	4.09	3.00
				what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	1		****/1434	****	3.72	4.14	4.15	****
		g system clearly		-	0	0	0	1	2	2	3		1167/1547		4.01	4.19	4.21	3.88
		was class cance		inea	0	0	0	0	0	5	3		1227/1574		4.49	4.64	4.61	4.38
				ning effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	1			1110/1554			4.10		3.83
J. 110W WO	ould you grade the overall teaching effectiveness				2	O	U	O	3	_	2	3.03	1110/1331	1.27	1.15	1.10	1.00	3.03
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lectures		prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	1111/1488	4.38	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.25
		ctor seem intere	_	_	0	0	0	0	0	3	5		1101/1493		4.80	4.73	4.70	4.63
				plained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	959/1486		4.33	4.32	4.32	4.25
		es contribute to			0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1118/1489		4.28	4.32	4.34	4.00
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques enh	nance yo	our understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	385/1277	4.65	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.43
		-	_	_														
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contribu	ite to v	what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1022/1279	4.30	4.19	4.17	4.20	3.60
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively end	couraged	d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	355/1270	4.90	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.80
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage f	fair and	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	728/1269	4.70	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.40
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		3	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	4.09	****
				Freq	uency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	ne			Majors	
										- 								
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 3														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	.t	
				I 0		Ot!	her					6						
				? 0														

Course-Section: ART 341 0201 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO ANIMATION Baltimore County Instructor: DYER, ERIC G Spring 2009

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 9

12

University of Maryland Page 114
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General																	
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	=	n this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	179/1576	4.51	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.89
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	392/1576		4.34	4.27	4.28	4.67
		estions reflect		0	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1342	3.50	4.58	4.32	4.30	****	
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	155/1520	4.77	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.88
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ıte to v	what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	758/1465	3.57	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.14
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	1	6	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1434	****	3.72	4.14	4.15	****
7. Was th	ne grading	system clearly	y explai	ned	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	718/1547	4.13	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.38
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1324/1574	4.31	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.25
9. How wo	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness					0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	222/1554	4.27	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.71
		Lecture	_															
1. Were t	he instri	actor's lecture	_	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	870/1488	4.38	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.50
		ctor seem inter	_	-	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1493		4.80	4.73	4.70	5.00
				plained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	339/1486		4.33	4.32	4.32	4.75
		es contribute to			1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	378/1489	4.38	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.75
			_	our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	113/1277	4.65	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.88
		Discus					_	_	_		_							
				what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1279		4.19	4.17	4.20	5.00
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1270		4.50	4.35	4.42	5.00
				d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	4.70	4.50	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	ssiul		6	1	0	0	U	1	Τ	4.50	****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	4.09	****
				Freq	uency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 28-55	0 0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 6 B 2		ке	quir	ea fo	or Ma	ajors	5	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo)r.	8
28-55 56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Co	nera:	1				0	TINDON O	~~d	9	Non	modom	1
84-150	0	3.00-2.99	0	D 0		Ge.	nera.	L				U	Under-g	Lau	<i>ש</i>	MOI1-	-major	1
64-150 Grad.	0	3.50-3.49	2	Б 0 F 0		רים.	ecti	700				0	#### - 1	Moana +	horo a	ro not	ono	rh
GLau.	U	3.30-4.00	۷	F 0		E.L	ecrl,	ves				U	respons				_	ìII
				I 0		0+1	her					9	respons	ca LU D	c sign	ııııcaı	10	
				? 1		OC.	1161					J						
				: ±														

Course-Section: ART 343 0101 University of Maryland Title HISTORY OF ANIMATION Baltimore County Instructor: WORDEN, FRED

Spring 2009

Page 115

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	41	
Questionnaires:	32	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

?

0

					Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5			Inst			Dept		Level					
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	2	0	0	0	5	12	13	4.27	940/1576	4.27	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.27
		ctor make clear			2	0	0	0	3	13	14	4.37	811/1576	4.37	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.37
		uestions reflec			2	0	0	0	3	5	22	4.63	443/1342	4.63	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.63
		uations reflect			2	14	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	441/1520	4.56	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.56
				what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	13	15	4.37	546/1465	4.37	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.37
				o what you learned	3	16	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	978/1434	3.92	3.72	4.14	4.15	3.92
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	2	0	0	1	2	6	21	4.57	457/1547	4.57	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.57
		was class canc			2	0	0	0	0	5	25	4.83	606/1574	4.83	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.83
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	10	0	0	0	4	9	9	4.23	742/1554	4.23	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.23
1 77	1	Lectur	_		_	0	^	0	1	4	0.0	4 70	462/1400	4 70	4 40	4 47	4 47	4 70
		uctor's lecture			5 4	0	0	0	Ţ	4	22	4.78	463/1488	4.78	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.78
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	582/1493	4.89	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.89
					5	0	0	0		10		4.56	619/1486	4.56	4.33	4.32	4.32	
		es contribute t			4 5	0	0	0	2 1	9	17 25	4.54	660/1489		4.28	4.32		4.54
5. Did au	.alovisua.	i tecnniques en	nance y	our understanding	5	U	U	U	Т	1	25	4.89	110/1277	4.89	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.89
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	10	0	1	1	3	4	13	4.23	689/1279	4.23	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.23
2. Were a	.ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	10	0	0	0	4	7	11	4.32	798/1270	4.32	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.32
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	10	0	0	1	1	4	16	4.59	590/1269	4.59	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.59
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		10	9	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	451/ 878	4.08	4.15	4.05	4.09	4.08
				Frequ	ionai	. Dia	+ v i b	1+101	_									
				rrequ	rency	DIS	CLID	ucioi	.1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	guir	ed fo	or M	aior	`====	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 9										-	-) •		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 4	General							3	Under-g	rad 3	32	Non-	major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 1								-					5	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Electives 2 #### - Means there are					are not	enous	rh					
	-			P 0		_							respons				_	•
				I O		Ot1	her				1	.5			5			
				2 0	Other					_	-							

Course-Section: ART 345 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County FILM II:SOUND & IMAGE

Title Instructor: COOK, CATHY Spring 2009

Enrollment: 10

Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 116

JUL 2, 2009

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	1	3	5	4.44	727/1576	4.44	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	968/1576	4.22	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	985/1520	4.11	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1194/1465	3.63	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	1	2	3.22	1320/1434	3.22	3.72	4.14	4.15	3.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1325/1547	3.56	4.01	4.19	4.21	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1417/1574	4.11	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	316/1554	4.60	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	Λ	2	2	2	2 62	1374/1488	3.63	4.40	4.47	4.47	3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	868/1493	4.78	4.40	4.73	4.70	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	981/1486		4.33	4.32	4.32	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	888/1489	4.33	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	309/1277		4.38	4.03	4.11	4.50
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		U	U	U	U	-	-	4.50	305/12//	1.50	1.30	1.03	7.11	1.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	603/1279	4.33	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	784/1270	4.33	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	671/ 878	3.67	4.15	4.05	4.09	3.67

Credits Ea	Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	 7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	2
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 sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ART 347 0101 University of Maryland Title WRITING FOR MEDIA ARTS

Baltimore County Spring 2009

I

0

Enrollment: 18

COOK, CATHY

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 14

Student	Course	Fwaluation	Ouestionnaire

Page 117

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

					Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4				5		Instructor		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 n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	757/1576	4.43	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.43
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	728/1576	4.43	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.43
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	835/1342	4.25	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.25
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	744/1520	4.36	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.36
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	813/1465	4.07	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.07
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	226/1434	4.71	3.72	4.14	4.15	4.71
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	992/1547	4.08	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.08
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	3	8	3	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	331/1554	4.58	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.58
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.50
2. Did th	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	5	9	4.64	1077/1493	4.64	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.64
3. Was le	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly							0	0	4	10	4.71	393/1486	4.71	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.71
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	614/1489	4.57	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.57
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	309/1277	4.50	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	393/1279	4.58	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.58
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	412/1270	4.75	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.75
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	444/1269	4.75	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.75
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		2	1	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	252/ 878	4.45	4.15	4.05	4.09	4.45
				Frequ	.ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27						Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0 B 4				~		,				0	1	, ,				-
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General					0	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	-major	1		
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Electives				0 #### - Means there are not			_	ıh				
P 0									responses to be significant				ıt					

Other

13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ART 361 0101

16

DIGITAL DARKROOM

THOMPSON, CALLA

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned

2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion

4. Were special techniques successful

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires: 14

Page 118 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

4 4.27 649/1279 4.27 4.19 4.17 4.20 4.27

7 4.64 559/1269 4.64 4.50 4.35 4.41 4.64

0 3 2 3.83 589/ 878 3.83 4.15 4.05 4.09 3.83

345/1270 4.82 4.50 4.35 4.42 4.82

			Frequencies						tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	595/1576	4.54	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	420/1576	4.64	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals		9	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	240/1342	4.80	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	648/1520	4.43	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	5	4	3.79	1081/1465	3.79	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	0	3	3	4	3.38	1270/1434	3.38	3.72	4.14	4.15	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	832/1574	4.71	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	463/1554	4.45	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	1010/1488	4.38	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	1184/1493	4.54	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	642/1486	4.54	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	1080/1489	4.08	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	394/1277	4.42	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.42
Discussion														

Frequency Distribution

0

0

0 0 0 4

1

0 0

1

2

9 4.82

3 0 0

3

3 0

4

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	14	Non-major	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enougi	a
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	9	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 362 0101

Title BLACK & WHITE PHOTOGRP

Instructor: SILBERG, STEVEN

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 15

G, STEVEN Spring 2009

Page 119 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer			_		ructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	243/1576	4.80	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	301/1576	4.73	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1342	****	4.58	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	161/1520	4.87	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	4	4	3.64	1180/1465	3.64	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	2	9	1	3.69	1127/1434	3.69	3.72	4.14	4.15	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	737/1547	4.36	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	911/1574		4.49	4.64	4.61	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	623/1554	4.33	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	970/1488	4.43	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	445/1493	4.93	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	596/1486	4.57	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	789/1489	4.43	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	250/1277	4.62	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	488/1279	4.46	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	208/1270	4.92	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	432/1269	4.77	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.77
4. Were special techniques successful	2	10	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	4.09	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.17	****
Pro		- -			_									

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	its Earned Cum. GPA Ex			Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	15	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

University of Maryland County

Spring 2009

Page 120 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section:	ART 368 0101	University of N
Title	DIGITAL ALTERNATIVES	Baltimore Co
Instructor:	PEREGOY, CHRIST	Spring 20

Enrollment:	10	J
Ouestionnaires:	1.0	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
Quescionnaires.	10	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies			\$	Instructor			Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course		0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	187/1576	4.88	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals		0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	279/1576	4.75	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals		6	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1342	****	4.58	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals		2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	339/1520	4.67	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned		3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	206/1465	4.75	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1434	****	3.72	4.14	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	755/1547	4.33	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.49	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness			0	0	0	1	5	4.83	146/1554	4.83	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	821/1486	4.40	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	813/1489	4.40	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	258/1277	4.60	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.20	855/1270	4.20	4.19	4.35	4.42	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	584/1269	4.60	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	1	U	1	0		****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	4.09	****
4. Were special deciminates successful	5	3	J		U	_	U	5.00	/ 676		4.13	4.05	4.09	
Frem	Dist	rib	ıt i oı	า										

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

Course-Section: ART 369 0101 University of Maryland
Title TOPICS IN PHOTOGRAPHY Baltimore County

Title TOPICS IN PHOTOGRAPHY Baltimore County Instructor: DURANT, MARK Spring 2009

Enrollment: 19

Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 121

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	\$		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	5	9	4.64	443/1576	4.64	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	910/1576	4.29	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	480/1342	4.60	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	311/1520	4.69	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	1	1	0	3	3.14	1360/1465	3.14	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1063/1434	3.80	3.72	4.14	4.15	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	1177/1574	4.43	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	104/1554	4.92	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	278/1488	4.89	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1053/1493	4.67	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	619/1486	4.56	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	350/1489	4.78	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	159/1277	4.75	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	310/1269	4.88	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	4.15	4.05	4.09	4.33
_		<u> </u>	.,											

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	13	Non-major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 375 0101 University of Maryland Title PHOTO/DIG PROC IN PRIN Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: CUSTEN, CALVIN Spring 2009

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 122

						Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did you	gain ne	w insights, skills f	rom this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.50
2. Did the i	instruc	tor make clear the	expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	1023/1576	4.17	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.17
3. Did the	exam qu	estions reflect the	expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.50
4. Did other	r evalu	ations reflect the	expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.00
7. Was the	grading	system clearly exp	lained	0	4	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1459/1547	3.00	4.01	4.19	4.21	3.00
8. How many	times	was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	606/1574	4.83	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.83
9. How would	d you g	rade the overall te	aching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.00
		Lecture															
1. Were the	instru	ctor's lectures wel	l prepared	2	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1353/1488	3.75	4.40	4.47	4.47	3.75
2. Did the	instruc	tor seem interested	in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	908/1493	4.75	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.75
3. Was lecti	ure mat	erial presented and	explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1386/1486	3.25	4.33	4.32	4.32	3.25
		s contribute to wha	-	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audio	ovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1277	****	4.38	4.03	4.11	****
		Discussion															
1. Did class	s discu	ssions contribute t	o what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.00
		ts actively encoura	_	4	0	0	0	0	1	1		636/1270		4.50	4.35	4.42	4.50
		_	and open discussion	4		0	0	0	1	1		644/1269		4.50	4.35		4.50
			Frequ	ıency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
a 1'. =	,	g gp3	- 101				_					_					
Credits Earr	nea 	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 5		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	5	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	4

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

Course-Section: ART 382 0101 University of Maryland
Title INTRO INTERACTIVE MEDI Baltimore County

Title INTRO INTERACTIVE MED

Instructor: MCDONALD, NEAL

Enrollment: 15 Ouestionnaires: 10 Spring 2009
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 123 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Instructor Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.50 637/1576 4.20 4.36 4.30 4.30 4.50 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.20 996/1576 4.15 4.34 4.27 4.28 4.20 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 4 6 4.60 480/1342 4.60 4.58 4.32 4.30 4.60 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 2 0 0 0 2 6 4.75 249/1520 4.38 4.33 4.25 4.25 4.75 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 6 2 0 0 1 1 2.75 1431/1465 3.25 3.86 4.12 4.09 2.75 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7 1 0 0 0 2 3.67 1142/1434 3.67 3.72 4.14 4.15 3.67 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 2 3 5 4.30 784/1547 4.40 4.01 4.19 4.21 4.30 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 1079/1574 4.53 4.49 4.64 4.61 4.50 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 3 4 3 4.00 924/1554 3.64 4.15 4.10 4.09 4.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 Ω 0 4 6 4.60 750/1488 4.36 4.40 4.47 4.47 4.60 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 3 7 4.70 1017/1493 4.60 4.80 4.73 4.70 4.70 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 3 3 3.80 1233/1486 3.78 4.33 4.32 4.32 3.80 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 696/1489 4.00 4.28 4.32 4.34 4.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 2 3 5 4.30 489/1277 4.29 4.38 4.03 4.11 4.30 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 1 1 4 3.75 962/1279 3.13 4.19 4.17 4.20 3.75 1 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 1 0 0 2 5 4.25 827/1270 4.04 4.50 4.35 4.42 4.25 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1 0 0 2 5 4.25 819/1269 4.21 4.50 4.35 4.41 4.25 4. Were special techniques successful 2 6 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 878 3.67 4.15 4.05 4.09 ****

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

Course-Section: ART 382 0201 University of Maryland Title INTRO INTERACTIVE MEDI

? 1

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 124

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 10 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

STAFF

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	1241/1576	4.20	4.36	4.30	4.30	3.90
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	3	0	0	7		1076/1576		4.34	4.27	4.28	4.10
		uestions reflec			0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1342	4.60	4.58	4.32	4.30	****
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	1041/1520	4.38	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.00
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1102/1465	3.25	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.75
	-	-		o what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1434	3.67	3.72	4.14	4.15	****
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	527/1547	4.40	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.50
		was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1041/1574	4.53	4.49	4.64	4.61	
	-			hing effectiveness	2	1	1	2	0	2			1381/1554		4.15		4.09	3.29
		Lectur																
1 Wome +	ho inata	uctor's lectur		nronarod	2	0	0	1	1	2	1	1 12	1192/1488	4.36	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.13
		ctor seem inter		1 1	2	0	0	1	0	1	6		1210/1493		4.40	4.47	4.47	4.50
				explained clearly	2	0	1	1	0	3	3		1253/1486		4.80	4.73	4.70	3.75
		teriai presente es contribute t			2	0	3	0	0	0	3		1313/1489		4.33	4.32		3.75
				our understanding	2	1	3 1	0	0	1	5	4.29	506/1277		4.28	4.03		4.29
5. Did au	laiovisua	i teciniiques en	nance y	our understanding	۷	1	1	U	U	Т	5	4.29	506/12//	4.29	4.30	4.03	4.11	4.29
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	3	1	0	0	2	2.50	1249/1279	3.13	4.19	4.17	4.20	2.50
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	4	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1024/1270	4.04	4.50	4.35	4.42	3.83
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	870/1269	4.21	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.17
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		4	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	671/ 878	3.67	4.15	4.05	4.09	3.67
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Onedita T	1	G GD3		The same of Consider				Das		_			m				Ma	
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades					asons				Ту:	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	\$	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 3														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	l				1	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					8						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ART 383 0101

SOUND DESIGN

NOHE, TIM

17

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 15

Page 125 JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ctudont	('011200	Evaluation	Olipetion	naira

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	-	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 544		General w insights,skil		+b.i	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	415/1576	4.77	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.67
		w insignes,ski tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	<i>5</i>	9	4.60	476/1576		4.34	4.27	4.28	4.67
		estions reflect			0	12	0	0	0	1	2		****/1342	4.50	4.58	4.32	4.30	****
	_	ations reflect		1 3	0	3	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	418/1520		4.33	4.25		4.58
			_	hat you learned	0	10	1	1	0	1	2		1292/1465	3.40	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.40
	_	-		what you learned	0	13	0	0	0	1	1		****/1434		3.72	4.14	4.15	****
		system clearly		-	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	690/1547	4.32	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.40
		was class cance	-	nea .	0	1	0	2	2	6	4		1529/1574		4.49	4.64	4.61	3.86
	-			ing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	10		4.29			4.15	4.10	4.09	4.29
J. 110	ara you g	1440 0110 0 0 0 1 4 1		ing cricociveness	_	Ü	ŭ	Ū	Ü		-	1.27	002, 2001	1.27	1.15	1.10	1.05	1.27
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures	well p	repared	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	589/1488	4.73	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.71
		tor seem intere	_	_	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	683/1493		4.80	4.73	4.70	4.86
				plained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	499/1486	4.76	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.64
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute to	what y	ou learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	526/1489	4.63	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.64
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enh	ance yo	ur understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	118/1277	4.74	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.86
		_	_	_														
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	312/1279	4.45	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.70
2. Were a	ll studen	ts actively end	couraged	to participate	5	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	805/1270	4.35	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.30
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage f	air and	open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	793/1269	4.55	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.30
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	sful		5	5	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	283/ 878	3.95	4.15	4.05	4.09	4.40
				Frequ	lency	7 Dist	tribu	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			ТУ	pe			Majors	}
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7			 quire		 or M	 a i o r		0	Graduat		0	Majo		12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6		1000	quir	su I	JI 1·1	ajoi	5	U	Graduat	C	U	Maje	'1	12
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		061	c. a.	-				_	onaci -g	Luu I		14011		5
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	7es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	rh
Graa.	Ü	3.30 1.00	-	P 0		ידר						•	respons				_	,
				I O		Ot.1	her				1	.4	_ 1550115		- 2-3-			
				? 2							_							

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ART 383 0201

SOUND DESIGN

NOHE, TIM

10

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

Page 126 JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ctudent	('Ollivea	Evaluation	()IIAGE I ON	$n \circ i \circ n \circ a$

								Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	- ' 1		Genera	_		_	0	•	0	0	-	_	4 00	100/1506	4 55	4 26	4 20	4 20	4 00
			w insights,ski			0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	187/1576	4.77	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.88
			tor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	448/1576	4.61	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.63
		_	estions reflec		_	0	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.50
			ations reflect			0	2 7	0	0	Ţ	2	3	4.33	768/1520	4.46	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.33
		_	-		what you learned	0	•	0	0	0	0	Τ		****/1465	3.40	3.86	4.12	4.09	****
			_		what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	1		****/1434	****	3.72	4.14	4.15	***
			system clearly		ined	0	0	0	1	1	1	5		838/1547	4.32	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.25
	-		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	758/1574	4.30	4.49	4.64	4.61	
9. 1	How woul	ld you g	rade the overa	ll teacl	ning effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	682/1554	4.29	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.29
			Lectur																
1 ,	·7 + lo.		ctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0	2	_	4.75	505/1488	4.73	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.75
			tor's lecture	-		0	0	•	0	0	1	6	4.75	632/1493	4.73	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.75
					3	0	0	0	0	0	1	7 7							
					xplained clearly	0	0	0		-	1	,	4.88	201/1486	4.76	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.88
			s contribute to	-	•	0	0	0	0	0 1	3	5		552/1489	4.63	4.28 4.38	4.32	4.34	4.63
5.	Dia aua:	lovisuai	techniques en	nance yo	our understanding	U	U	U	U	Т	Τ	6	4.63	243/1277	4.74	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.63
			Discus	sion															
1. 1	Did clas	ss discus	ssions contrib	ute to v	what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	712/1279	4.45	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.20
					d to participate	3	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	736/1270	4.35	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.40
			-	_	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1269	4.55	4.50	4.35	4.41	
			chniques succe		a open arrearren	3	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	709/ 878		4.15	4.05		3.50
						_	_	_	-	_	-	_							
					Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ıtior	ı									
Cred	dits Ear	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	ne .			Majors	
															,				
	-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	\$	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	7
	-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
	-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	-major	1
84	-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Gr	ad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
					P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	nt	
					I 0		Oth	her					7						

Course-Section: ART 387 0101 University of Maryland Title EXPRESSION TIME & MOTI

Baltimore County SHEPPARD, JENNY Spring 2009

Instructor: Enrollment: 11

Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 127

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

									ncies	5	_		ructor		_		Level	
		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	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	757/1576	4.43	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.43
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	324/1576		4.34	4.27	4.28	4.71
		uestions reflec		1 3	0	4	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	770/1342		4.58	4.32	4.30	4.33
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.50
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	850/1465	4.00	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.00
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1263/1434	3.40	3.72	4.14	4.15	3.40
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	280/1547	4.71	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.71
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.50
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	772/1554	4.20	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.20
		Lectur	е															
1. Were ti	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	666/1488	4.67	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.67
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	734/1493		4.80	4.73	4.70	4.83
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	241/1486		4.33	4.32	4.32	4.83
		es contribute t			1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.67
				our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	5		123/1277			4.03		
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	665/1279	4.25	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.25
				ed to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	3		412/1270		4.50	4.35	4.42	
				nd open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	3		444/1269	4.75	4.50	4.35	4.41	
		echniques succe			3	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	164/ 878	4.67	4.15	4.05	4.09	4.67
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arnod	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				P.O.	asons	,			Ту	no			Majors	,
CIECUICS E			· 							, 							ajors	,
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	յh
				Р 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					6						

Course-Section: ART 390 0101 University of Maryland Title IRC FELLOWS TOPICS Instructor: BOOT, LEE

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 10 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

> I 0

								eque:	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
		Genera	.1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1019/1576	4.20	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.20
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	1	3.50	1392/1576	3.50	4.34	4.27	4.28	3.50
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.58	4.32	4.30	***
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	4	1	0	2	3	0	3.17	1454/1520	3.17	4.33	4.25	4.25	3.17
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	6	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1431/1465	2.75	3.86	4.12	4.09	2.75
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	2	0	2	3	3	0	3.13	1353/1434	3.13	3.72	4.14	4.15	3.13
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	4	1	1	3	1	0	2.67	1506/1547	2.67	4.01	4.19	4.21	2.67
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.49	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	2	1	2	4	1	3.10	1431/1554	3.10	4.15	4.10	4.09	3.10
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	6	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	1388/1488	3.50	4.40	4.47	4.47	3.50
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	908/1493	4.75	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.75
3. Was le	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1471/1486	2.50	4.33	4.32	4.32	2.50
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	6	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1255/1489	3.75	4.28	4.32	4.34	3.75
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	159/1277	4.75	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.75
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	938/1279	3.80	4.19	4.17	4.20	3.80
				ed to participate	5	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1116/1270	3.60	4.50	4.35	4.42	3.60
				nd open discussion	5	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1188/1269	3.20	4.50	4.35	4.41	3.20
		echniques succe			5	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	671/ 878			4.05	4.09	3.67
			Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio:	n										
Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Re	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	\$
														- 				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	10
28-55																		
56-83						Ger	nera	1				5	Under-g	rad 1	LO	Non-	-major	0
84-150	34-150 5 3.00-3.49 1 D 0																	
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0						ecti [.]	ves				0	#### -				_	jh
	P 0												respons	es to b	oe sigr	nificar	ıt	

Other

Page 128

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: ART 392A 0101 University of Maryla Title WEB INTERFACE DESIGN Baltimore County Instructor: CORDOVA, VIVIAN Spring 2009

Enrollment:

Grad.

3.50-4.00 10

Ρ

Ι

0

0

Questionnaires: 13

14

University of Maryland Page 129
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Student	Course	Evaluation	Question	naire
---------	--------	------------	----------	-------

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	.s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	893/1576	4.31	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.31
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	1	1	3	5	3	3.62	1364/1576	3.62	4.34	4.27	4.28	3.62
		uestions reflec		_	0	12	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1342	****	4.58	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	1	0	0	4	7	1	3.75	1256/1520	3.75	4.33	4.25	4.25	3.75
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	2	3	3.38	1299/1465	3.38	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.38
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute	to what you learned	1	0	1	3	4	2	2	3.08	1364/1434	3.08	3.72	4.14	4.15	3.08
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expl	ained	0	0	0	2	5	4	2	3.46	1360/1547	3.46	4.01	4.19	4.21	3.46
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.49	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tea	ching effectiveness	2	0	2	1	4	4	0	2.91	1485/1554	2.91	4.15	4.10	4.09	2.91
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	the instr		prepared	3	0	1	2	2	4	1	3.20	1433/1488	3.20	4.40	4.47	4.47	3.20	
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	1	9	4.90	557/1493	4.90	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.90
				explained clearly	3	0	2	0	4	3	1	3.10	1414/1486	3.10	4.33	4.32	4.32	3.10
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	3	0	2	1	3	3	1	3.00	1415/1489	3.00	4.28	4.32	4.34	3.00
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance	your understanding	3	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	802/1277	3.90	4.38	4.03	4.11	3.90
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc			what you learned	7	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1161/1279	3.17	4.19	4.17	4.20	3.17
				ed to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	505/1270		4.50	4.35	4.42	4.67
		-	_	nd open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.67
		echniques succe			7	4	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 878	***	4.15	4.05	4.09	****
		Frequ	ency	/ Dist	trib	ution	1											
			•	-														
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 S	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	12
28-55	0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1						_			-						_		
56-83								l				6	Under-g	rad 1	3	Non-	major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0															

Electives

Other

Course-Section: ART 392B 0101

ART AND COMMUNITY

Title Instructor: MOREN, LISA

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 5 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 130 Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

				equer			-		ructor	Course	_			Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.30	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	222/1576	4.80	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1		****/1342	****	4.58	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.33	4.25	4.25	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	175/1465	4.80	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	151/1434		3.72	4.14	4.15	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3		690/1547	4.40	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1574		4.49	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1		4.75	194/1554		4.15	4.10	4.09	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.40	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.28	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.38	4.03	4.11	5.00
_,														
Discussion	0	0	_	•	0	0	_	F 00	1 /1050	F 00	4 10	4 1 1	4 00	F 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.19	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	1	0	0	0	0	3		1/1269	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.15	4.05	4.09	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.12	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.24	****
	-	-	-	-	-	-	_		, 202					
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	1									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	5	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	

 $\mbox{\ensuremath{$P$}} \mbox{\ensuremath{$0$}} \mbo$

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 131 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

Course-Section: ART 423 0101

15

ART SINCE 1945

JACOB, PREMINDA

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 14

Over the law to		3.7.7	Fre	equer		5	-		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	130/1576	4.93	4.36	4.30	4.46	4.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	244/1576	4.79	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	430/1342	4.64	4.58	4.32	4.46	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.33	4.25	4.38	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	424/1465	4.46	3.86	4.12	4.22	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	625/1434	4.31	3.72	4.14	4.30	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	708/1547	4.38	4.01	4.19	4.24	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	866/1574	4.69	4.49	4.64	4.69	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	146/1554	4.83	4.15	4.10	4.24	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.77	484/1488	4.77	4.40	4.47	4.55	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	422/1486	4.69	4.33	4.73	4.41	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	461/1489	4.69	4.28	4.32	4.38	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	121/1277	4.85	4.38	4.03	4.04	4.85
J. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding		U	U	U	U	2	11	1.05	121/12//	1.05	1.30	1.03	1.01	1.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.19	4.17	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	164/ 878	4.67	4.15	4.05	4.33	4.67
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.69	4.69	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.52	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	Τ.		****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	3.90	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	13	U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	3/5		5.00	4.01	3.90	
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	ı									

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

Course-Section: ART 429B 0101 University of Maryland Title JUL 2, 2009

Baltimore County ALTERNATIVE AESTHETICS Instructor: MAHONEY, JAMES Spring 2009

Enrollment: 10

Questionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 132

Job IRBR3029

				Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General		_					_	_							
1. Did you gain new	9 ,		1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	415/1576		4.36	4.30	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructo		1 3	1	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	698/1576	4.44	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.44
3. Did the exam ques			1	7	0	0	0	0	2		****/1342	****	4.58	4.32	4.46	****
4. Did other evaluat		1 3	1	4	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	683/1520	4.40	4.33	4.25	4.38	4.40
5. Did assigned read	-	_	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	290/1465	4.63	3.86	4.12	4.22	4.63
-	-	to what you learned	2	1	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	647/1434	4.29	3.72	4.14	4.30	4.29
7. Was the grading s		lained	2	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	718/1547	4.38	4.01	4.19	4.24	4.38
8. How many times wa	as class cancelled		2	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1324/1574	4.25	4.49	4.64	4.69	4.25
9. How would you gra	ade the overall tea	aching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	146/1554	4.83	4.15	4.10	4.24	4.83
1. Were the instruct	or's lectures well	l prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	278/1488	4.89	4.40	4.47	4.55	4.89
2. Did the instructo			1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture mater		3	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	311/1486	4.78	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.78
4. Did the lectures	-		1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	350/1489	4.78	4.28	4.32	4.38	4.78
5. Did audiovisual t		-	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	113/1277	4.88	4.38	4.03	4.04	4.88
1 5'1 1 1'	Discussion		_	0	_	-	_	_		4 00	641 (1000	4 00	4 10	4 1 1	4 21	4 00
1. Did class discuss		-	3	0	0	Τ	0	2	4	4.29	641/1279	4.29	4.19	4.17	4.31	4.29
2. Were all students		3	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	458/1270	4.71	4.50	4.35	4.53	4.71	
3. Did the instructo	and open discussion	3	0	0	0	Τ	0	6	4.71	491/1269	4.71	4.50	4.35	4.55	4.71	
4. Were special tech		3	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.15	4.05	4.33	5.00	
	Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	ı										
Credits Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors		

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there a	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 430 0101

Title GRAPHIC DESIGN VI

Instructor: RE, PEGGY
Enrollment: 21

Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 133 JUL 2, 2009 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	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	244/1576	4.79	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.46	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	167/1520	4.86	4.33	4.25	4.38	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	335/1465	4.56	3.86	4.12	4.22	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	167/1434	4.79	3.72	4.14	4.30	4.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	228/1547	4.77	4.01	4.19	4.24	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	832/1574	4.71	4.49	4.64	4.69	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	173/1554	4.79	4.15	4.10	4.24	4.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	324/1488	4.86	4.40	4.47	4.55	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.41	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	155/1489	4.93	4.28	4.32	4.38	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	347/1277	4.46	4.38	4.03	4.04	4.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	194/1279	4.86	4.19	4.17	4.31	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	458/1270	4.71	4.50	4.35	4.53	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	332/1269	4.86	4.50	4.35	4.55	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.15	4.05	4.33	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 431 0101 University of Maryland GRAPHIC DESIGN VII Baltimore County NUNOO-QUARCOO,

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 19

19

Spring 2009

Page 134

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

C+11don+	00117000	Errolustion	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnarie

Quartiena							Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	nı gain ne	ew insights,skil	=	this course	2	0	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	289/1576	4.67	4.36	4.30	4.46	4.76
		ctor make clear			2	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	336/1576		4.34	4.27	4.35	4.71
		estions reflect			2	11	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1342		4.58	4.32	4.46	5.00
		ations reflect			2	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	239/1520	4.56	4.33	4.25	4.38	4.76
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	ıte to v	what you learned	2	7	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	366/1465	4.08	3.86	4.12	4.22	4.50
6. Did wr	5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	1	8	4.89	118/1434	4.00	3.72	4.14	4.30	4.89
7. Was th	7. Was the grading system clearly explained						1	0	3	5	7	4.06	999/1547	3.71	4.01	4.19	4.24	4.06
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		2	0	0	0	1	12	4	4.18	1379/1574	4.30	4.49	4.64	4.69	4.18
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	155/1554	4.58	4.15	4.10	4.24	4.82
	Lecture																	
1. Were ti	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1488	4.75	4.40	4.47	4.55	5.00
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1493		4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1486	4.75	4.33	4.32	4.41	5.00
		es contribute to			6	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1489	4.67	4.28	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques enl	nance yo	our understanding	5	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	194/1277	4.75	4.38	4.03	4.04	
		Discus			_	_	_	_										
				what you learned	'/	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1279	4.75	4.19	4.17	4.31	
				d to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1270		4.50	4.35	4.53	5.00
				d open discussion	7 7	0 2	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. were s	special te	echniques succes	ssiui		/	2	U	U	1	0	9	4.80	129/ 878	4.40	4.15	4.05	4.33	4.80
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 14		Re	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	16
28-55						~		,				•	1		0			2
56-83						Ge	nera	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	9	Non-	-major	3
84-150												0			1			1-
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 9 F 0					Εl	ecti	ves				0	<pre>#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant</pre>				ın	
I 0					0-1	her				1	.6	respons	es to p	e sign	ıııcan	1L		
_ *					Ut.	ner.				1	.0							
? 0																		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section	: ART 431 0201	University of Maryland	Page 135
Title	GRAPHIC DESIGN VII	Baltimore County	JUL 2, 2009
Instructor:	NUNOO-QUARCOO,	Spring 2009	Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

19

Questions								_	ncies	S 4	-		tructor	Course	_			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	527/1576	4.67	4.36	4.30	4.46	4.58
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	5	1	6		1088/1576		4.34	4.27	4.35	4.08
		uestions reflec			0	9	0	0	0	1	2	4.67			4.58	4.32	4.46	4.67
	_	uations reflect		_	0	1	0	0	1	5	5		731/1520		4.33	4.25	4.38	4.36
				what you learned	0	9	1	0	0	0	2		1166/1465		3.86	4.12		3.67
	_	-		to what you learned	0	3	3	0	2	1	3	3.11	1356/1434	4.00	3.72	4.14	4.30	3.11
		g system clearl		-	0	1	3	0	2	2	4	3.36	1389/1547	3.71	4.01	4.19	4.24	3.36
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	1	5			1189/1574			4.64	4.69	4.42
	How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes						0	0	2	2	5	4.33	623/1554	4.58		4.10	4.24	4.33
		Lectur		_														
		uctor's lecture		0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	,		4.40	4.47	4.55	4.50	
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	2	10			4.92	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.83
		_		explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	7				4.33	4.32	4.41	4.50
		es contribute t		-	0	0	0	2	0	2	8	4.33	,	4.67	4.28	4.32	4.38	4.33
5. Did au	udiovisua.	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	7	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	132/1277	4.75	4.38	4.03	4.04	4.80
		Discus	gion															
1 Did cl	lass disc			what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	445/1279	4.75	4.19	4.17	4 31	4.50
				ed to participate	4	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	756/1270	4.69	4.50	4.35	4.53	4.38
				nd open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.55	5.00
		echniques succe		a open albeabbion	4	4	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	464/ 878			4.05		4.00
	-	-																
				Frequ	lency	/ Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
																·		
00-27	0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 10 8-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0					Red	quir	ed i	or Ma	ajor	S	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	11
	66-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0					Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	-major	1
84-150						061	icia.	_				_	onder g	144 1	. 4	14011	a J O I	_
Grad.						E14	ecti	ves			0 #### -			Means t	here a	re not	enouc	rh
					516	LULI	v CD				U	respons			111			
P 0						0.1					-	1	T CPDOILP	CD CO L	,c 5191.	ıııcaı.	10	

Other

11

0

Course-Section: ART 435A 0101 University of Maryland ICONOGRAPHY & MEANING Baltimore County

Page 136 Title JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN Job IRBR3029

9	Enrollment:	9
^		0

Enrollment:	9
Questionnaires:	9

Ctudent	('Ollivea	Evaluation	Olipetion	naira

	Questions				NR	NA	Fre	eque:	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	nı gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	2	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1283/1576	3.86	4.36	4.30	4.46	3.86
		ctor make clear			2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	515/1576		4.34	4.27	4.35	4.57
		uations reflect			2	2	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	683/1520		4.33	4.25	4.38	4.40
				what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	850/1465	4.00	3.86	4.12	4.22	4.00
	. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned					5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1434	****	3.72	4.14	4.30	****
7. Was th	. Was the grading system clearly explained					0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	939/1547	4.14	4.01	4.19	4.24	4.14
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	567/1574	4.86	4.49	4.64	4.69	4.86
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	623/1554	4.33	4.15	4.10	4.24	4.33
		Lectur	2															
1. Were t	he instru	uctor's lecture	s well	orepared	3	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1334/1488	3.83	4.40	4.47	4.55	3.83
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	734/1493	4.83	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.83
3. Was le	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1025/1486	4.17	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.17
4. Did th	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1020/1489	4.17	4.28	4.32	4.38	4.17
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	3	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	692/1277	4.00	4.38	4.03	4.04	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ite to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	554/1279	4.40	4.19	4.17	4.31	4.40
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	4	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	855/1270	4.20	4.50	4.35	4.53	4.20
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage :	fair an	d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	728/1269	4.40	4.50	4.35	4.55	4.40
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		4	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	4.33	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	}
														- 				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quir	ed i	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	6
28-55 56-83						a.	nera	1				1	TT		9	Man		3
84-150	0 2	2.00-2.99				Ger	nera.	Т				Т	Under-g	Lau	9	NON-	major	3
						. רקו	ecti					0	инии.	Moona +	howo -		020000	.h
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0					FIE	SCLT,	ves				U	#### - respons				_	111
	1 0					Oth	hor					5	respons	es to D	e sign	ıııcaı	I C	
I 0						ULI	uet					S						

Course-Section: ART 484 0201 University of Maryland Page 137 Title ADVNCD 3D CMPUTR ANIMA Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009

Instructor: BAILEY, DAN

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 8

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

				Fre	quer	ncies			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 cours	e 0		0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	. 0		0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.35	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goal	.s 0		2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	221/1342	4.83	4.58	4.32	4.46	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	. 0		0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.33	4.25	4.38	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you lea	rned 0		7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1465	****	3.86	4.12	4.22	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0		0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	387/1547	4.63	4.01	4.19	4.24	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0		0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	527/1574	4.88	4.49	4.64	4.69	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effects	veness 0		0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	298/1554	4.63	4.15	4.10	4.24	4.63
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0		0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	505/1488	4.75	4.40	4.47	4.55	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	t 0		0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained cle	arly 0		0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	530/1486	4.63	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0		0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	228/1489	4.88	4.28	4.32	4.38	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understa	nding 0		0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	113/1277	4.88	4.38	4.03	4.04	4.88
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you lea	rned 2		0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.19	4.17	4.31	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate			0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.50	4.35	4.53	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discu			0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.55	5.00
	Frequenc	У	Dist	ribu	itior	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected	Grades				Rea	sons				Ту	pe			Majors	
	7														

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

Course-Section: ART 488 0101
Title ADV TOPICS:AIM
Instructor: DYER, ERIC G
Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 138 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			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	Λ	Ω	Λ	1	1	5	6	4.23	976/1576	4.23	4.36	4.30	4.46	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	5	3		1333/1576	3.69	4.34	4.27	4.35	3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	929/1520		4.33	4.25	4.38	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	1	3	0	1		1445/1465		3.86	4.12	4.22	2.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	0	0	0	0		****/1434		3.72	4.14	4.30	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	0	2	1	3	3		1231/1547		4.01	4.19	4.24	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	422/1574	4.92	4.49	4.64	4.69	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	3	6	2	3.67	1227/1554	3.67	4.15	4.10	4.24	3.67
. 3														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	0	4	6	4.08	1209/1488	4.08	4.40	4.47	4.55	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	908/1493	4.75	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	1025/1486	4.17	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	1313/1489	3.50	4.28	4.32	4.38	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	309/1277	4.50	4.38	4.03	4.04	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.19	4.17	4.31	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	326/1270	4.83	4.50	4.35	4.53	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.55	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	4.15	4.05	4.33	4.33

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-	_		
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 489A 0101 University of Maryland Title PRINT MEDIA, PHOTOGRAP Baltimore County

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Title PRINT MEDIA, PInstructor: CAZABON, LYNN

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Page 139

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	4	4	4	3	3.12	1526/1576	3.12	4.36	4.30	4.46	3.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	4	6	3	3.47	1405/1576	3.47	4.34	4.27	4.35	3.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	***	4.58	4.32	4.46	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	0	8	3	3.44	1388/1520	3.44	4.33	4.25	4.38	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	4	1	2	5	1	2.85	1422/1465	2.85	3.86	4.12	4.22	2.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	5	1	0	3	1	2.40	1424/1434	2.40	3.72	4.14	4.30	2.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	2	1	2	1	5	3	3.58	1311/1547	3.58	4.01	4.19	4.24	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	665/1574	4.80	4.49	4.64	4.69	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	6	3	3	3.50	1303/1554	3.50	4.15	4.10	4.24	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.40	4.47	4.55	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	1362/1493	4.23	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	1197/1486	3.91	4.33	4.32	4.41	3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	4	2	3	3.25	1381/1489	3.25	4.28	4.32	4.38	3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	2	1	4	4	3.67	943/1277	3.67	4.38	4.03	4.04	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	Λ	1	1	2	5	1	3 40	1106/1279	3.40	4.19	4.17	4.31	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	U	0	2	4	5	4.27	818/1270	4.27	4.50	4.35	4.53	4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	2	1	4	4	3.91	992/1269	3.91	4.50	4.35	4.55	3.91
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	0	1	1	1	0		****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	/	/	U	Τ.	Т.		U	3.00	/ 0/0		4.ID	4.05	4.33	

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	1
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	15	-	_		
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 489B 0101 University of Maryland Page 140 Title Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 TIMEBASED: VID, FLM, ANIM

Instructor: COOK, CATHY

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 12

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

							Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.36	4.30	4.46	4.50
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	279/1576	4.75	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.75
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.58	4.32	4.46	****
		uations reflect			0	2	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.33	4.25	4.38	5.00
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1465	4.67	3.86	4.12	4.22	4.67
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	130/1434	4.86	3.72	4.14	4.30	4.86
		g system clearl			0	1	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	978/1547	4.09	4.01	4.19	4.24	4.09
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.49	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	160/1554	4.80	4.15	4.10	4.24	4.80
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.40	4.47	4.55	5.00
		ctor seem inter			6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.41	5.00
		es contribute t			6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.28	4.32	4.38	5.00
				our understanding	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1277		4.38	4.03	4.04	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.19	4.17	4.31	5.00
				ed to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.53	5.00
				nd open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.55	5.00
		echniques succe		a open arboabbien	6	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	221/ 878		4.15	4.05		4.50
				Frequ	ency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
	11040		210	0112														
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade								Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7						Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	`s	0	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r	11
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 4																		
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 3 C 0						Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	-major	1
84-150 5 3.00-3.49 3 D 0																		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ſh
Р 0											respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt			
												-						

Other

11

I

?

0

1

University of Maryland Course-Section: ART 489C 0101 Page 141 Title TEAM-BASED GAME PROJEC Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Spring 2009 Instructor: MCDONALD, NEAL

Enrollment: 8

Questionnaires: 8

Ctudant	('011760	Evaluation	Ollection	naira

		Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.36	4.30	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	1	1		1546/1576	2.88	4.34	4.27	4.35	2.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	2	0		1505/1520	2.63	4.33	4.25	4.38	2.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1465	****	3.86	4.12	4.22	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1427/1434	2.33	3.72	4.14	4.30	2.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	3	1	0	2.25	1532/1547	2.25	4.01	4.19	4.24	2.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.49	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	2	4	1	0	2.63	1517/1554	2.63	4.15	4.10	4.24	2.63
Tarkuus														
Lecture	2	0	2	1	2	1	0	2 22	1400/1400	2 22	4 40	4.47	4 55	0 22
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	∠ 1	Τ	0		1480/1488	2.33	4.40		4.55	2.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	3	2	3		1321/1493	4.33	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	_	Ţ	0		1461/1486	2.67	4.33	4.32	4.41	2.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	U T	2	3 3	0	0		1475/1489	2.33	4.28	4.32	4.38	2.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	U	U	3	3	0	U	2.50	1238/1277	2.50	4.38	4.03	4.04	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	1249/1279	2.50	4.19	4.17	4.31	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1054/1270	3.75	4.50	4.35	4.53	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1116/1269	3.50	4.50	4.35	4.55	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	862/ 878	2.00	4.15	4.05	4.33	2.00
Frequ	ency.	Dist	ribu	ution	n									

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

Course-Section: ART 492 0101 University of Maryland TOPICS: ART OR MEDIA II Title Baltimore County

Instructor: ROSENBERG, JASO Spring 2009

Enrollment: 11 Ouestionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 142

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Instructor Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 5 4.13 1073/1576 4.13 4.36 4.30 4.46 4.13 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 1 5 4.25 939/1576 4.25 4.34 4.27 4.35 4.25 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 6 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1342 5.00 4.58 4.32 4.46 5.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 2 0 2 1 1 2 3.50 1362/1520 3.50 4.33 4.25 4.38 3.50 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 3 0 1 1 1 2 3.80 1067/1465 3.80 3.86 4.12 4.22 3.80 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 2 1 1 0 1 $2.40\ 1424/1434\ 2.40\ 3.72\ 4.14\ 4.30\ 2.40$ 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 1 0 0 2 3 3.57 1316/1547 3.57 4.01 4.19 4.24 3.57 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 972/1574 4.63 4.49 4.64 4.69 4.63 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 2 0 1 5 4.13 849/1554 4.13 4.15 4.10 4.24 4.13 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 1 1 0 1 5 4.00 1233/1488 4.00 4.40 4.47 4.55 4.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1493 5.00 4.80 4.73 4.80 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 1 1 5 4.25 959/1486 4.25 4.33 4.32 4.41 4.25 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 0 6 4.38 845/1489 4.38 4.28 4.32 4.38 4.38 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 1 1 1 5 4.25 533/1277 4.25 4.38 4.03 4.04 4.25 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 2 1 2 3.50 1064/1279 3.50 4.19 4.17 4.31 3.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 1 2 0 3 3.83 1024/1270 3.83 4.50 4.35 4.53 3.83 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 773/1269 4.33 4.50 4.35 4.55 4.33 4. Were special techniques successful 2 5 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 878 **** 4.15 4.05 4.33 ****

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

Course-Section	n: ART 495 0125	University of Maryland	Page 143
Title	INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH	Baltimore County	JUL 2, 2009
T	DEDEGOV GID I GE	G	Tab TDDD2020

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section	: ART 495 0125	University of Maryland	Page 143
Title	INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH	Baltimore County	JUL 2, 2009
Instructor:	PEREGOY, CHRIST	Spring 2009	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	1		

Questionnaires: 1

				_	ncies		-			Course	_			
Questions	NR	NA		2	3	- 4 	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	4.80	4.36	4.30	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.35	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.33	4.25	4.38	5.00
8 How many times was class cancelled	Ω	Ω	Ω	Ω	Ω	Ω	1	5 00	1/1574	5 00	4 49	4 64	4 69	5 00

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	4.80	4.36	4.30	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.35	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.33	4.25	4.38	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.49	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	4.80	4.15	4.10	4.24	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	5.00	4.60	5.00	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00

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

Course-Section: ART 495 0134 University of Maryland INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH

Page 144 Baltimore County Spring 2009 JUL 2, 2009 Title Job IRBR3029 Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN

Enrollment:	1		
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

							Fr	eane:	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		Mean
		Genera:	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	4.80	4.36	4.30	4.46	5.00
2. Did th	he instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.35	5.00
4. Did of	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.33	4.25	4.38	5.00
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	3.86	4.12	4.22	5.00
6. Did w	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learn	ed 0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.67	3.72	4.14	4.30	5.00
7. Was th	he grading	g system clearly	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	4.67	4.01	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.49	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectivene	ss 0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	4.80	4.15	4.10	4.24	5.00
		Lecture	e															
1. Were t	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.40	4.47	4.55	5.00
2. Did th	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presented	d and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.41	5.00
4. Did th	he lecture	es contribute to	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.28	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did a	udiovisua	l techniques enl	nance y	your understandin	g 0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	4.50	4.38	4.03	4.04	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.19	4.17	4.31	5.00
				ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.53	5.00
		-	_	nd open discussio	n 0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269		4.50	4.35	4.55	5.00
		echniques succes			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878		4.15	4.05	4.33	5.00
				Fr	equenc	y Dis	trib	utio:	n									
	_ ,					-							_				,	
Credits I	Earned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grad	es 			Re	asons	5 			Ty]	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0			0	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	-major	1				

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

Course-Section:	ART 495 0143	University of Maryland	Page 145
Title	INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH	Baltimore County	JUL 2, 2009
Instructor:	THOMPSON, CALLA	Spring 2009	Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title	INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH	Baltimore County	JUL 2, 20
Instructor:	THOMPSON, CALLA	Spring 2009	Job IRBR30
Enrollment:	1		

Questionnaires: 1

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3		5	Instr Mean	uctor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	
Questions														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	4.80	4.36	4.30	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.35	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.49	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	4.80	4.15	4.10	4.24	5.00

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

Course-Section:	ART 495 (0145	University of	Maryland	Pa	age	146
Title	INDEP STUD	IO RESEARCH	Baltimore	County	JUL	2,	2009
Instructor:	WORDEN, FRI	ED	Spring	2009	Job :	IRBR	3029

Enrollment:	1				
Ouestionnaires:	1	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

					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	0	1	0	4.00	1148/1576	4.80	4.36	4.30	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.35	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	878/1434	4.67	3.72	4.14	4.30	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1041/1547	4.67	4.01	4.19	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.49	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	4.80	4.15	4.10	4.24	5.00

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

Course-Section: ART 495 0146 University of Maryland INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH Baltimore County

Title Spring 2009 Instructor: CUSTEN, CALVIN

Enrollment: 1 Questionnaires: 1

Student Co	urse Evaluatio	n Questionnaire
------------	----------------	-----------------

Page 147 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

	Ouestions							Fre	_	ncies	3 .	_		ructor	Course	_		Level	
			Question	.S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			Genera	1															
1.	Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	4.80	4.36	4.30	4.46	5.00
2.	Did th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.35	5.00
3.	Did th	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1342	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.46	5.00
4.	Did ot	her evalı	uations reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.33	4.25	4.38	5.00
5.	Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	3.86	4.12	4.22	5.00
6.	Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.67	3.72	4.14	4.30	5.00
7.	Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expl	ained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	4.67	4.01	4.19	4.24	5.00
8.	How ma:	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.49	4.64	4.69	5.00
9.	How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll tea	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.80	4.15	4.10	4.24	4.00
			Lectur	е															
1.	Were t	he instru	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.40	4.47	4.55	5.00		
2.	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3.	Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.41	5.00
4.	Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.28	4.32	4.38	5.00
5.	Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance	your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	692/1277	4.50	4.38	4.03	4.04	4.00
			Discus	sion															
1.	Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.19	4.17	4.31	5.00
2.	Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courag	ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.53	5.00
3.	Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.55	5.00
4.	Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	_	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.15	4.05	4.33	5.00
			Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n											
Cro	dita E	arnod	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Po:	asons	,			Ty	00			Majors	,
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade										200118	- 			ту.					,
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 0							Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	3	0	Graduat	e	1	Majo	or	1
	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1																		
56	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0						Gei	nerai	1				1	Under-a	rad	0	Non-	maior	0

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

Course-Section: ART 624 0101 University of Maryland ART & CRIT Instructor: JACOB, PREMINDA

Title

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 14

14

Page 148 Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions							equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
		General	 1															
1 Did you	ı dain new	Genera. insights,skil		m this course	1	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	893/157	5 4 31	4.36	4.30	4.43	4.31
		or make clear			1	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	958/157		4.34	4.27	4.32	4.23
		stions reflect			2	7	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	972/134		4.58	4.32	4.38	4.00
	_	tions reflect		_	1	1	0	0	4	3	5		1003/152		4.33	4.25	4.36	4.08
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	748/146		3.86	4.12	4.25	4.15
	_	-		o what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	978/143		3.72	4.14	4.35	3.92
		system clearly			1	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	492/154	7 4.54	4.01	4.19	4.24	4.54
8. How man	ny times w	as class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1056/157	4.54	4.49	4.64	4.75	4.54
9. How wor	uld you gr	ade the overal	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	584/155	4.36	4.15	4.10	4.18	4.36
		Lecture	e															
1. Were th	ne instruc	tor's lectures	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	982/148	3 4.42	4.40	4.47	4.52	4.42
2. Did the	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Was lecture material presented and explained clear							0	0	1	11	4.92	501/149	3 4.92	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.92
3. Was led	Was lecture material presented and explained clear Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	1	5	5	4.36	861/148	4.36	4.33	4.32	4.37	4.36
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand						0	0	2	5	5	4.25	955/148		4.28	4.32	4.38	4.25
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	2	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	533/127	7 4.25	4.38	4.03	4.08	4.25
		Discus																
			1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	488/127		4.19	4.17	4.34	4.46		
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned Were all students actively encouraged to participations.						0	0	0	5	8	4.62	550/127	4.62	4.50	4.35	4.53	4.62
				d open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	677/126		4.50	4.35	4.55	4.46
4. Were sp	pecial tec	hniques succes	ssful		1	6	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	694/ 87	3.57	4.15	4.05	4.11	3.57
		Semina	c															
				announced theme	10	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 8	5 ****	5.00	4.72	4.79	****
				ividual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 7	****	5.00	4.69	4.77	****
				what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 7		****	4.64	4.70	****
		s contribute t			11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 8	-	5.00	4.61	4.70	****
5. Were ci	riteria fo	or grading made	e clear		11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 37	5 ****	5.00	4.01	4.10	****
		Self I																
				what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 4	-	5.00	4.60	4.50	****
		ons make clear		_	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 2		5.00	4.83	4.80	****
		ts with the in			13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 3	-	5.00	4.67	4.33	****
4. Was the	e feedback	:/tutoring by p	proctor	s helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 2	3 ****	5.00	4.78	4.75	****
		Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	ı											
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad								asons				Т	ype			Majors	}
00-27	00-27 4 0.00-0.99 0 A 7								or Ma			 0	 Gradua	 -	3	 Majo		5
28-55	0	1.00-0.99	0	A / B 5		кес	1ull.e	eu IC	ντ Mg	Jors	>	U	Gradua		٥	ма јо	T	5
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-	arad 1	L1	Non-	major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		001						-		,	-			-
Grad.							ectiv	res				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoua	ıh
	P 0													ses to b				•
				I 0		Oth	ner				1	3			3			
				? 1														

Course-Section: ART 638 0125
Title TEACH PRACTICUM
Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN
Enrollment: 1

Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 149 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	е
---	---

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1539/1576	3.00	4.36	4.30	4.43	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1523/1576	3.00	4.34	4.27	4.32	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1460/1465	2.00	3.86	4.12	4.25	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1459/1547	3.00	4.01	4.19	4.24	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.49	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.15	4.10	4.18	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.40	4.47	4.52	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.33	4.32	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1415/1489	3.00	4.28	4.32	4.38	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	692/1277	4.00	4.38	4.03	4.08	4.00

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

Course-Section: ART 640 0101 Title

IMAGING & DIGITAL STUD

Instructor: DURANT, MARK

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 6

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 150 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	787/1576	4.40	4.36	4.30	4.43	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	939/1576	4.25	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	395/1520	4.60	4.33	4.25	4.36	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	708/1465	4.20	3.86	4.12	4.25	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	878/1434	4.00	3.72	4.14	4.35	4.00
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	1	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	838/1547	4.25	4.01	4.19	4.24	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	2		1202/1574	4.40	4.49	4.64	4.75	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	712/1554	4.25	4.15	4.10	4.18	4.25
T a relevance														
Lecture	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	4 22	1040/1400	4 22	4 40	4 47	4 50	4 22
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	Τ		1048/1488	4.33	4.40	4.47	4.52	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.33	4.32	4.37	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.28	4.32	4.38	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	Τ	U	U	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.38	4.03	4.08	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	219/1279	4.80	4.19	4.17	4.34	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	355/1270	4.80	4.50	4.35	4.53	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1269	4.80	4.50	4.35	4.55	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.15	4.05	4.11	4.00
i. Here special committees successful	_	_	Ū	ŭ	_	Ū	_	1.00	101, 0.0	1.00	1.10	1.05		2.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.79	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.70	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.70	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.10	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	6
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 enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	4	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 740 0101 University of Maryland ADV. I&D STUDIO DURANT, MARK

Title

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 151

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 7 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			NR	NA	Fro	eque 2	ncies	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		Questions 															
		General															
			s from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	541/1576	4.57	4.36	4.30	4.43	4.57
			he expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	515/1576		4.34	4.27	4.32	4.57
	_		the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342		4.58	4.32	4.38	5.00
			he expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	291/1520		4.33	4.25	4.36	4.71
			e to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	616/1465		3.86	4.12	4.25	4.29
			ute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434		3.72	4.14	4.35	5.00
		g system clearly	-	0	2	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	900/1547		4.01	4.19	4.24	4.20
		was class cancel		0	0	0	0	0	7	0		1459/1574		4.49	4.64	4.75	4.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overall	teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	263/1554	4.67	4.15	4.10	4.18	4.67
		actor's lectures		0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	786/1488	4.57	4.40	4.47	4.52	4.57
			ted in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	1150/1493	4.57	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.57
		-	and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	596/1486	4.57	4.33	4.32	4.37	4.57
	id the lectures contribute to what you learned id audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi				0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	614/1489	4.57	4.28	4.32	4.38	4.57
5. Did au	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					0	1	1	1	4	4.14	623/1277	4.14	4.38	4.03	4.08	4.14
		Discussi															
			e to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	400/1279	4.57	4.19	4.17	4.34	4.57
		_	uraged to participate	0	0	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.50	4.35	4.53	4.00
			ir and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	332/1269	4.86	4.50	4.35	4.55	4.86
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques success	ful	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.15	4.05	4.11	5.00
		Seminar															
			o the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.72	4.79	5.00
2. Was th	e instruc	ctor available fo	r individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.77	5.00
_			what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.70	5.00
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading made	clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	5.00	4.01	4.10	5.00
			Freq	uency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	1	0 A 6			anir	 ad f	or Ma	iore		0	 Graduat		1	Majo		1	
	00-27					quii '	cu I	OT IM	י זיין י	,	J	Graduat	_	_	ria JC) <u>+</u>	1
	66-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	-major	6
84-150	0		0 D 0		Gei	пста	Τ.				U	onder-9	Lau	U	INOI1-	iiia jul	U
	Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 2 F 0						ves				0	#### -	Maana +	horo -	re not	enous	rh
Grau.		Elt	CCLI	ves				U	respons				_	111			
		P 0 I 0		O+1	her					6	respons	co LU L	e sigi	ııııdı	10		
			3 0		ULI	TICT					U						
			? U														

Course-Section: ART 790 0140 University of Maryland Title IND. STUDIES Baltimore County Instructor: COOK, CATHY Spring 2009 Enrollment: 1

Questionnaires: 1

Page 152 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

								3		Inst	ructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	2	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General																
1. Did you gain new	insights, skills fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1148/15	576	4.50	4.36	4.30	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructo	or make clear the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/15	576	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.32	5.00
6. Did written assig	gnments contribute	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/14	134	4.50	3.72	4.14	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading s	system clearly expl	ained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1459/15	547	4.00	4.01	4.19	4.24	3.00
8. How many times wa	as class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/15	574	5.00	4.49	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you gra	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiven Lecture					0	0	1	0	4.00	924/15	554	4.00	4.15	4.10	4.18	4.00
5. Did audiovisual t	your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1149/12	277	3.00	4.38	4.03	4.08	3.00	
	Self Paced																
1. Did self-paced sy	ystem contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	40	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.50	5.00
2. Did study question	ons make clear the	expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	24	5.00	5.00	4.83	4.80	5.00
		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	35	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.33	5.00
 Were your contacts with the instructor helpful Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 				0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	28	5.00	5.00	4.78	4.75	5.00
	Fre						n										
Credits Earned								3				Тур	pe			Majors	

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Course-Section: ART 790 0142

1

IND. STUDIES

CUSTEN, CALVIN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

Page 153 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies				Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect			
Questions	NR	N	IA.	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this cour	se 0		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	4.50	4.36	4.30	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goal	.s 0		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.32	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goa	ils 0		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goal	.s 0		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.33	4.25	4.36	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you le	earned 0		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	3.86	4.12	4.25	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you	learned 0		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	878/1434	4.50	3.72	4.14	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	4.00	4.01	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.49	4.64	4.75	5.00
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.40	4.47	4.52	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subje	ect 0		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1411/1493	4.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained cl	early 0		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.33	4.32	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	_		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.28	4.32	4.38	4.00
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you le	arned 0		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.19	4.17	4.34	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to partic			0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1270	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open disc			0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878		4.15	4.05	4.11	5.00
	Frequenc	y D	Dist	ribu	tior	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected	l Grades		Reasons							Туј	уре		Majors		;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A	1		Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0					 0	Major		1				

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 154 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

1/1269 5.00 4.50 4.35 4.55 5.00

Course-Section: ART 792 0138 Title THESIS PREP. Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA

Enrollment: 1 Questionnaires: 1

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion

		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	1	0	4.00	1148/1576	4.25	4.36	4.30	4.43	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	4.75	4.34	4.27	4.32	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.33	4.25	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	3.86	4.12	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.50	3.72	4.14	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	4.75	4.01	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.49	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.15	4.10	4.18	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.40	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.28	4.32	4.38	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.19	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.53	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00

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

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Course-Section: ART 792 0141 University of Maryland Page 155 THESIS PREP. JUL 2, 2009 WORDEN, FRED Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	2	
Questionnaires:	2	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title

Instructor:

		Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect						
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean				
General																		
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	637/1576	4.25	4.36	4.30	4.43	4.50				
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	608/1576	4.75	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.50				
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.33	4.25	4.36	5.00				
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	3.86	4.12	4.25	5.00				
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	878/1434	4.50	3.72	4.14	4.35	4.00				
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	527/1547	4.75	4.01	4.19	4.24	4.50				
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.49	4.64	4.75	5.00				
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.15	4.10	4.18	5.00				
Lecture																		
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	Ο	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.40	4.47	4.52	5.00				
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1493	5.00	4.80			5.00				
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1486	5.00	4.33			5.00				
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1489	5.00	4.28			5.00				
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.38	33 4.32 4.37 28 4.32 4.38						
Discussion																		
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	Λ	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.19	4.17	4.34	5.00				
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.53	5.00				
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.55	5.00				
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878		4.15	4.05	4.11	5.00				
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n													
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	S			Туј	pe			Majors	1				
00.07		Demind for Maine																

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