

Course-Section: EDUC 305 0101  
 Title TCHNG RDG & WRITNG ECE  
 Instructor: ROBERTS-KING, H (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 549  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	5	6	5	3.50	1402/1522	3.50	4.42	4.30	4.34	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	5	6	5	3.50	1365/1522	3.50	4.34	4.26	4.25	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	****	4.52	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	7	3	7	3.70	1222/1476	3.70	4.43	4.22	4.26	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	6	2	9	3.85	932/1412	3.85	4.10	4.06	4.03	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	9	6	3.95	872/1381	3.95	4.28	4.08	4.13	3.95	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	2	4	8	3.55	1280/1500	3.55	4.35	4.18	4.13	3.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.72	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	1	4	6	2	3.33	1346/1497	4.10	4.24	4.11	4.13	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	1148/1440	4.17	4.52	4.45	4.46	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	1140/1448	4.67	4.86	4.71	4.71	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	5	7	5	3.74	1218/1436	4.04	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	5	2	8	3.58	1251/1432	3.82	4.34	4.29	4.29	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	2	1	1	4	2	3.30	995/1221	3.59	3.74	3.93	3.94	3.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	3	3	4	5	3.56	1005/1280	3.56	4.40	4.10	4.14	3.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	930/1277	4.00	4.61	4.34	4.38	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	735/1269	4.31	4.65	4.31	4.39	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	525/ 854	3.90	4.29	4.02	4.00	3.90	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 305 0101  
 Title TCHNG RDG & WRITNG ECE  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 550  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	5	6	5	3.50	1402/1522	3.50	4.42	4.30	4.34	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	5	6	5	3.50	1365/1522	3.50	4.34	4.26	4.25	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	****	4.52	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	7	3	7	3.70	1222/1476	3.70	4.43	4.22	4.26	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	6	2	9	3.85	932/1412	3.85	4.10	4.06	4.03	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	9	6	3.95	872/1381	3.95	4.28	4.08	4.13	3.95	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	2	4	8	3.55	1280/1500	3.55	4.35	4.18	4.13	3.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.72	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	125/1497	4.10	4.24	4.11	4.13	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	1	7	8	4.24	1063/1440	4.17	4.52	4.45	4.46	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	737/1448	4.67	4.86	4.71	4.71	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	772/1436	4.04	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	3	3	9	4.06	1013/1432	3.82	4.34	4.29	4.29	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	8	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	714/1221	3.59	3.74	3.93	3.94	3.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	3	3	4	5	3.56	1005/1280	3.56	4.40	4.10	4.14	3.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	930/1277	4.00	4.61	4.34	4.38	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	735/1269	4.31	4.65	4.31	4.39	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	525/ 854	3.90	4.29	4.02	4.00	3.90	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 310 0101  
 Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION  
 Instructor: GAURIN, ADELL  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 551  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	6	6	3.89	1229/1522	4.18	4.42	4.30	4.34	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	7	4.11	1016/1522	4.21	4.34	4.26	4.25	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1285	4.71	4.52	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	7	4.28	769/1476	4.45	4.43	4.22	4.26	4.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	5	7	2	3.39	1234/1412	3.50	4.10	4.06	4.03	3.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	693/1381	3.97	4.28	4.08	4.13	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	571/1500	4.57	4.35	4.18	4.13	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	932/1517	4.49	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	898/1497	4.08	4.24	4.11	4.13	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	798/1440	4.52	4.52	4.45	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.86	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	295/1436	4.78	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	3	9	4.13	977/1432	4.31	4.34	4.29	4.29	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	2	9	4	4.00	606/1221	4.06	3.74	3.93	3.94	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	298/1280	4.36	4.40	4.10	4.14	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	421/1277	4.69	4.61	4.34	4.38	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	277/1269	4.85	4.65	4.31	4.39	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	385/ 854	4.20	4.29	4.02	4.00	4.15	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.33	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.35	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.55	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.74	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.43	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	30/ 47	4.63	4.77	4.41	4.56	4.43	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	16/ 45	4.52	4.55	4.30	4.39	4.71	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 39	5.00	4.92	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	21/ 35	4.40	4.56	4.31	4.26	4.20	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: EDUC 310 0101  
 Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION  
 Instructor: GAURIN, ADELL  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 551  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 310 0201  
 Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION  
 Instructor: DANNA, S  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 552  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	656/1522	4.18	4.42	4.30	4.34	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	5	7	4.31	824/1522	4.21	4.34	4.26	4.25	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	0	6	4	4.71	318/1285	4.71	4.52	4.30	4.30	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	11	4.62	367/1476	4.45	4.43	4.22	4.26	4.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	1	2	6	3.62	1106/1412	3.50	4.10	4.06	4.03	3.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	3	6	3.77	1040/1381	3.97	4.28	4.08	4.13	3.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	275/1500	4.57	4.35	4.18	4.13	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	1241/1517	4.49	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	756/1497	4.08	4.24	4.11	4.13	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	751/1440	4.52	4.52	4.45	4.46	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.86	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	217/1436	4.78	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	632/1432	4.31	4.34	4.29	4.29	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	0	0	0	7	4.11	564/1221	4.06	3.74	3.93	3.94	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	1	8	4.08	690/1280	4.36	4.40	4.10	4.14	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	470/1277	4.69	4.61	4.34	4.38	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	299/1269	4.85	4.65	4.31	4.39	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	330/ 854	4.20	4.29	4.02	4.00	4.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	22/ 47	4.63	4.77	4.41	4.56	4.83	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	27/ 45	4.52	4.55	4.30	4.39	4.33	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.92	4.40	4.68	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	13/ 35	4.40	4.56	4.31	4.26	4.60	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.12	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 311 0101  
 Title PSYC FOUNDATION OF EDU  
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 553  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	889/1522	4.30	4.42	4.30	4.34	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	4	4.13	996/1522	4.36	4.34	4.26	4.25	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	938/1285	4.25	4.52	4.30	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	3	6	3.87	1145/1476	4.23	4.43	4.22	4.26	3.87	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	7	2	3.53	1149/1412	3.90	4.10	4.06	4.03	3.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	7	4	4.00	806/1381	4.23	4.28	4.08	4.13	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	839/1500	4.19	4.35	4.18	4.13	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	341/1517	4.92	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	4	3	3.83	1089/1497	4.08	4.24	4.11	4.13	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	763/1440	4.60	4.52	4.45	4.46	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	765/1448	4.82	4.86	4.71	4.71	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	478/1436	4.68	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	682/1432	4.57	4.34	4.29	4.29	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	311/1221	4.55	3.74	3.93	3.94	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	874/1280	4.19	4.40	4.10	4.14	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	527/1277	4.68	4.61	4.34	4.38	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	332/1269	4.86	4.65	4.31	4.39	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	252/ 854	4.41	4.29	4.02	4.00	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 311 0201  
 Title PSYC FOUNDATION OF EDU  
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 554  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	814/1522	4.30	4.42	4.30	4.34	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	454/1522	4.36	4.34	4.26	4.25	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	531/1285	4.25	4.52	4.30	4.30	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	397/1476	4.23	4.43	4.22	4.26	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	547/1412	3.90	4.10	4.06	4.03	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	382/1381	4.23	4.28	4.08	4.13	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	850/1500	4.19	4.35	4.18	4.13	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	487/1517	4.92	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	573/1497	4.08	4.24	4.11	4.13	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	604/1440	4.60	4.52	4.45	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	683/1448	4.82	4.86	4.71	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	295/1436	4.68	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	454/1432	4.57	4.34	4.29	4.29	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	194/1221	4.55	3.74	3.93	3.94	4.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	337/1280	4.19	4.40	4.10	4.14	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	375/1277	4.68	4.61	4.34	4.38	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	200/1269	4.86	4.65	4.31	4.39	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	246/ 854	4.41	4.29	4.02	4.00	4.42
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.35	4.58	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.55	4.52	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.74	4.49	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	4.43	4.45	4.34	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	3.33	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 312 0101  
 Title ANALYSIS OF TCHNG & LR  
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 555  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	767/1522	4.69	4.42	4.30	4.34	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	545/1522	4.66	4.34	4.26	4.25	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	1	2	4	4.67	366/1285	4.83	4.52	4.30	4.30	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	703/1476	4.53	4.43	4.22	4.26	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	680/1412	4.24	4.10	4.06	4.03	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	806/1381	4.27	4.28	4.08	4.13	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	435/1500	4.64	4.35	4.18	4.13	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	767/1517	4.80	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.24	4.11	4.13	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	716/1440	4.69	4.52	4.45	4.46	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1448	4.95	4.86	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	357/1436	4.66	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	394/1432	4.81	4.34	4.29	4.29	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	92/1221	4.04	3.74	3.93	3.94	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	566/1280	4.52	4.40	4.10	4.14	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	781/1277	4.52	4.61	4.34	4.38	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	654/1269	4.59	4.65	4.31	4.39	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	88/ 854	4.40	4.29	4.02	4.00	4.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 1
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 9
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	7

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant



Course-Section: EDUC 312 0201  
 Title ANALYSIS OF TCHNG & LR  
 Instructor: SMITH JR, MURDU  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 556  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1522	4.69	4.42	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	193/1522	4.66	4.34	4.26	4.25	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1285	4.83	4.52	4.30	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	255/1476	4.53	4.43	4.22	4.26	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	466/1412	4.24	4.10	4.06	4.03	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	297/1381	4.27	4.28	4.08	4.13	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	242/1500	4.64	4.35	4.18	4.13	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	691/1517	4.80	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.24	4.11	4.13	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	353/1440	4.69	4.52	4.45	4.46	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	494/1448	4.95	4.86	4.71	4.71	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	478/1436	4.66	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	161/1432	4.81	4.34	4.29	4.29	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1011/1221	4.04	3.74	3.93	3.94	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	222/1280	4.52	4.40	4.10	4.14	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	375/1277	4.52	4.61	4.34	4.38	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	381/1269	4.59	4.65	4.31	4.39	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	1	1	0	1	5	4.00	426/ 854	4.40	4.29	4.02	4.00	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 317 0101  
 Title PROC & ACQUIS READ  
 Instructor: SHELTON, NANCY  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 557  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	246/1522	4.80	4.42	4.30	4.34	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	702/1522	4.40	4.34	4.26	4.25	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.52	4.30	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	378/1476	4.60	4.43	4.22	4.26	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.10	4.06	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	434/1381	4.40	4.28	4.08	4.13	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	1147/1500	3.80	4.35	4.18	4.13	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1161/1517	4.40	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	654/1497	4.25	4.24	4.11	4.13	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	798/1440	4.50	4.52	4.45	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.86	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	601/1436	4.50	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1432	4.50	4.34	4.29	4.29	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1221	****	3.74	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	184/1280	4.80	4.40	4.10	4.14	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	317/1277	4.80	4.61	4.34	4.38	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1097/1269	3.60	4.65	4.31	4.39	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.29	4.02	4.00	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 318 0101  
 Title INSTRUCTION OF READING  
 Instructor: SHELTON, NANCY  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 558  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	681/1522	4.44	4.42	4.30	4.34	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	1016/1522	4.11	4.34	4.26	4.25	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	366/1285	4.67	4.52	4.30	4.30	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	827/1476	4.22	4.43	4.22	4.26	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	493/1412	4.33	4.10	4.06	4.03	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	392/1381	4.44	4.28	4.08	4.13	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1298/1500	3.50	4.35	4.18	4.13	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1080/1517	4.50	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	573/1497	4.33	4.24	4.11	4.13	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	412/1440	4.78	4.52	4.45	4.46	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.86	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	263/1436	4.78	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	579/1432	4.56	4.34	4.29	4.29	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	739/1221	3.83	3.74	3.93	3.94	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.40	4.10	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.61	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.65	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.29	4.02	4.00	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.77	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 45	****	4.55	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.92	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.56	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.12	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 319 0101  
 Title ASSESS READING  
 Instructor: SMALL, SUE  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 559  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	4.61	4.42	4.30	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	545/1522	4.03	4.34	4.26	4.25	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1476	4.69	4.43	4.22	4.26	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	760/1412	3.44	4.10	4.06	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1381	4.75	4.28	4.08	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1500	4.39	4.35	4.18	4.13	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.38	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	898/1497	4.06	4.24	4.11	4.13	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 319 0201  
 Title ASSESS READING  
 Instructor: SMALL, SUE ELLE  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 560  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	929/1522	4.61	4.42	4.30	4.34	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1344/1522	4.03	4.34	4.26	4.25	3.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	660/1476	4.69	4.43	4.22	4.26	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	0	2	2	2.89	1353/1412	3.44	4.10	4.06	4.03	2.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	331/1381	4.75	4.28	4.08	4.13	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1168/1500	4.39	4.35	4.18	4.13	3.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	802/1517	4.38	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	820/1497	4.06	4.24	4.11	4.13	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	1269/1440	3.86	4.52	4.45	4.46	3.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	629/1448	4.86	4.86	4.71	4.71	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	876/1436	4.25	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1036/1432	4.00	4.34	4.29	4.29	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1221	****	3.74	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	978/1280	3.63	4.40	4.10	4.14	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	714/1277	4.38	4.61	4.34	4.38	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.65	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.29	4.02	4.00	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.77	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	4.55	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.92	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.56	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.12	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Non-major 9
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 9

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 320 0101  
 Title TEACH MATH IN ELEM SCH  
 Instructor: KINACH, BARBARA  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 561  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	605/1522	4.50	4.42	4.30	4.34	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1509/1522	2.50	4.34	4.26	4.25	2.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1324/1476	3.50	4.43	4.22	4.26	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1327/1412	3.00	4.10	4.06	4.03	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1286/1381	3.00	4.28	4.08	4.13	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1430/1500	3.00	4.35	4.18	4.13	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1080/1517	4.50	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1277/1497	3.50	4.24	4.11	4.13	3.50
Lecture														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1165/1221	2.50	3.74	3.93	3.94	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	390/1280	4.50	4.40	4.10	4.14	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.61	4.34	4.38	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.65	4.31	4.39	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.29	4.02	4.00	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 324 0101  
 Title PROCESS SEM IN ECE-M/S  
 Instructor: BELL, DEBORAH A  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 562  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	176/1522	4.91	4.42	4.30	4.34	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	193/1522	4.82	4.34	4.26	4.25	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.52	4.30	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.43	4.22	4.26	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	466/1412	4.36	4.10	4.06	4.03	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	114/1381	4.82	4.28	4.08	4.13	4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	242/1500	4.73	4.35	4.18	4.13	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.72	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	348/1497	4.56	4.24	4.11	4.13	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.52	4.45	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.86	4.71	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	123/1436	4.90	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	161/1432	4.90	4.34	4.29	4.29	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	3	0	0	1	2	2.83	1117/1221	2.83	3.74	3.93	3.94	2.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.40	4.10	4.14	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.61	4.34	4.38	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.65	4.31	4.39	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	157/ 854	4.63	4.29	4.02	4.00	4.63
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.35	4.58	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.55	4.52	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.74	4.49	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.43	4.45	4.34	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	3.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 1	D 0	Under-grad	8
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 1	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
			Other		10

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 330 0101  
 Title TCHNG SCIENCE:ELEM SCH  
 Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 563  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	190/1522	4.88	4.42	4.30	4.34	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	310/1522	4.71	4.34	4.26	4.25	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	165/1285	4.89	4.52	4.30	4.30	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	135/1476	4.88	4.43	4.22	4.26	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	3	4	5	3.86	932/1412	3.86	4.10	4.06	4.03	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	247/1381	4.60	4.28	4.08	4.13	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	415/1500	4.57	4.35	4.18	4.13	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	837/1517	4.73	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	264/1497	4.67	4.24	4.11	4.13	4.67	
Lecture															
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1221	****	3.74	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	214/1280	4.76	4.40	4.10	4.14	4.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	489/1277	4.65	4.61	4.34	4.38	4.65	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	244/1269	4.88	4.65	4.31	4.39	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	1	1	2	12	4.35	277/ 854	4.35	4.29	4.02	4.00	4.35	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	16	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						



Course-Section: EDUC 331 0101  
 Title SOCIAL STUDIES:ELEM SC  
 Instructor: FITZHUGH, WILLI  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 564  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	404/1522	4.69	4.42	4.30	4.34	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	322/1522	4.69	4.34	4.26	4.25	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	745/1285	4.29	4.52	4.30	4.30	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	444/1476	4.54	4.43	4.22	4.26	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	448/1412	4.38	4.10	4.06	4.03	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	372/1381	4.46	4.28	4.08	4.13	4.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	799/1500	4.23	4.35	4.18	4.13	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	389/1517	4.92	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	506/1497	4.40	4.24	4.11	4.13	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	432/1440	4.77	4.52	4.45	4.46	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	656/1448	4.85	4.86	4.71	4.71	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	383/1436	4.69	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	600/1432	4.54	4.34	4.29	4.29	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	2	2	6	4.00	606/1221	4.00	3.74	3.93	3.94	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	566/1280	4.29	4.40	4.10	4.14	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	672/1277	4.43	4.61	4.34	4.38	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	532/1269	4.57	4.65	4.31	4.39	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	314/ 854	4.29	4.29	4.02	4.00	4.29	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 351 0101  
 Title SOC,EMO,&ETHICAL DEV Y  
 Instructor: FRYER, MARY  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 565  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	320/1522	4.75	4.42	4.30	4.34	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	358/1522	4.67	4.34	4.26	4.25	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.52	4.30	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	226/1476	4.75	4.43	4.22	4.26	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	126/1412	4.83	4.10	4.06	4.03	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.28	4.08	4.13	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	144/1500	4.83	4.35	4.18	4.13	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.72	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1089/1497	3.83	4.24	4.11	4.13	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	192/1440	4.90	4.52	4.45	4.46	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.86	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	383/1436	4.70	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	161/1432	4.90	4.34	4.29	4.29	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	279/1221	4.50	3.74	3.93	3.94	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	267/1280	4.70	4.40	4.10	4.14	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.61	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	223/1269	4.90	4.65	4.31	4.39	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	180/ 854	4.56	4.29	4.02	4.00	4.56	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.77	4.41	4.56	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	19/ 45	4.57	4.55	4.30	4.39	4.57	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.92	4.40	4.68	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	12/ 35	4.83	4.56	4.31	4.26	4.83	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	15/ 34	4.67	4.50	4.30	4.12	4.67	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 12
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Other 11

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 352 0101  
 Title: PROCESS SEM ECE-MEDIA  
 Instructor: COSTELLO, MARGA  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 566  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	320/1522	4.75	4.42	4.30	4.34	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	255/1522	4.75	4.34	4.26	4.25	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	366/1285	4.67	4.52	4.30	4.30	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	792/1476	4.25	4.43	4.22	4.26	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	973/1412	3.80	4.10	4.06	4.03	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	413/1381	4.43	4.28	4.08	4.13	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	483/1500	4.50	4.35	4.18	4.13	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	555/1517	4.88	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.24	4.11	4.13	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	452/1440	4.75	4.52	4.45	4.46	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.86	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	514/1436	4.57	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	502/1432	4.63	4.34	4.29	4.29	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	739/1221	3.83	3.74	3.93	3.94	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.40	4.10	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.61	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	255/1269	4.88	4.65	4.31	4.39	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	174/ 854	4.57	4.29	4.02	4.00	4.57	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	25/ 47	4.50	4.77	4.41	4.56	4.50	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	21/ 45	4.50	4.55	4.30	4.39	4.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.92	4.40	4.68	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	14/ 35	4.50	4.56	4.31	4.26	4.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	17/ 34	4.50	4.50	4.30	4.12	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 353 0101  
 Title MATERIALS FOR EARLY LI  
 Instructor: SCULLY, PAT  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 567  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	383/1522	4.64	4.34	4.26	4.25	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.52	4.30	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	151/1476	4.86	4.43	4.22	4.26	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	248/1412	4.64	4.10	4.06	4.03	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	69/1381	4.93	4.28	4.08	4.13	4.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	180/1500	4.79	4.35	4.18	4.13	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	389/1517	4.93	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	104/1497	4.90	4.24	4.11	4.13	4.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.52	4.45	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.86	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	98/1436	4.92	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.34	4.29	4.29	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	572/1221	4.10	3.74	3.93	3.94	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.40	4.10	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.61	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	223/1269	4.91	4.65	4.31	4.39	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	88/ 854	4.80	4.29	4.02	4.00	4.80	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.77	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.55	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.92	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.56	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.12	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 387 0101  
 Title TUTORING AND LITERACY  
 Instructor: ~~TAYLOR, JOBY B~~Laura Wilmarth  
 Enrollment: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 568  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 7 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	211/1522	4.86	4.42	4.30	4.34	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	299/1522	4.71	4.34	4.26	4.25	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.52	4.30	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	151/1476	4.86	4.43	4.22	4.26	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	119/1412	4.86	4.10	4.06	4.03	4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	272/1381	4.57	4.28	4.08	4.13	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	134/1500	4.86	4.35	4.18	4.13	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	873/1517	4.71	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.24	4.11	4.13	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	798/1440	4.50	4.52	4.45	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.86	4.71	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	415/1436	4.67	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	454/1432	4.67	4.34	4.29	4.29	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	606/1221	4.00	3.74	3.93	3.94	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	184/1280	4.80	4.40	4.10	4.14	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.61	4.34	4.38	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1269	4.80	4.65	4.31	4.39	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	166/ 854	4.60	4.29	4.02	4.00	4.60
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.77	4.41	4.56	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.55	4.30	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.92	4.40	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.56	4.31	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 388 0101  
 Title INCLUSION & INSTRUCTIO  
 Instructor: PARKER, LYNETTA  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 569  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	3	11	4.39	756/1522	4.39	4.42	4.30	4.34	4.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	545/1522	4.50	4.34	4.26	4.25	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	706/1285	4.33	4.52	4.30	4.30	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	746/1476	4.29	4.43	4.22	4.26	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	5	6	5	3.67	1077/1412	3.67	4.10	4.06	4.03	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	458/1381	4.39	4.28	4.08	4.13	4.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	312/1500	4.67	4.35	4.18	4.13	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	6	4.33	1217/1517	4.33	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	794/1497	4.13	4.24	4.11	4.13	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	837/1440	4.47	4.52	4.45	4.46	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	710/1448	4.82	4.86	4.71	4.71	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	636/1436	4.47	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	745/1432	4.41	4.34	4.29	4.29	4.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	265/1221	4.53	3.74	3.93	3.94	4.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	515/1280	4.36	4.40	4.10	4.14	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	421/1277	4.71	4.61	4.34	4.38	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	477/1269	4.64	4.65	4.31	4.39	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	161/ 854	4.62	4.29	4.02	4.00	4.62	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 18 Non-major 18
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 18	
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 403 0101  
 Title ELEM INTRNSHP SEMINAR  
 Instructor: BOURNE, BARBARA  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 570  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	669/1522	4.45	4.42	4.30	4.42	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	623/1522	4.45	4.34	4.26	4.34	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	366/1285	4.67	4.52	4.30	4.42	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	551/1476	4.45	4.43	4.22	4.31	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	1239/1412	3.38	4.10	4.06	4.11	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	207/1381	4.67	4.28	4.08	4.21	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	935/1500	4.10	4.35	4.18	4.25	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	1349/1517	4.11	4.72	4.65	4.71	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.24	4.11	4.21	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1136/1440	4.13	4.52	4.45	4.52	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.86	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	876/1436	4.25	4.46	4.29	4.32	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1139/1432	3.88	4.34	4.29	4.34	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	175/1221	4.67	3.74	3.93	4.04	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	553/1280	4.30	4.40	4.10	4.28	4.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	442/1277	4.70	4.61	4.34	4.50	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	332/1269	4.80	4.65	4.31	4.49	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	380/ 854	4.17	4.29	4.02	4.31	4.17	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	67/ 79	4.00	4.35	4.58	4.67	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	59/ 77	4.00	4.55	4.52	4.60	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 65	****	4.74	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	57/ 78	4.33	4.43	4.45	4.58	4.33	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	40/ 80	4.33	4.33	4.11	4.14	4.33	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.77	4.41	4.51	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	15/ 45	4.75	4.55	4.30	4.22	4.75	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.92	4.40	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.56	4.31	4.13	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	20/ 34	4.33	4.50	4.30	4.11	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	
				I 0	Other 9
				? 0	

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 408 0101  
 Title SCNDRY INTRNSHP SEMINA  
 Instructor: OLIVA, LINDA M.  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 571  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	2	8	3	5	3.47	1413/1522	3.74	4.42	4.30	4.42	3.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	5	6	5	3.50	1365/1522	3.25	4.34	4.26	4.34	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1285	****	4.52	4.30	4.42	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	2	1	8	5	3.67	1245/1476	3.83	4.43	4.22	4.31	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	4	5	3	3	2.94	1341/1412	3.47	4.10	4.06	4.11	2.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	1	8	4	3	3.16	1268/1381	3.58	4.28	4.08	4.21	3.16	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	4	3	2	5	2.80	1454/1500	3.40	4.35	4.18	4.25	2.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	13	6	4.25	1268/1517	4.63	4.72	4.65	4.71	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	2	5	6	2	3.24	1376/1497	3.24	4.24	4.11	4.21	3.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	2	4	3	4	3.50	1359/1440	3.50	4.52	4.45	4.52	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	1313/1448	4.21	4.86	4.71	4.75	4.21	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	1	4	4	3	3.36	1329/1436	3.36	4.46	4.29	4.32	3.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	2	1	5	2	3	3.23	1338/1432	3.23	4.34	4.29	4.34	3.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	781/1221	3.77	3.74	3.93	4.04	3.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	5	2	5	3.57	1000/1280	3.57	4.40	4.10	4.28	3.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	781/1277	4.29	4.61	4.34	4.50	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	805/1269	4.21	4.65	4.31	4.49	4.21	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.29	4.02	4.31	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	74/ 79	4.17	4.35	4.58	4.67	3.33	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	2	0	2	2	3.67	69/ 77	4.33	4.55	4.52	4.60	3.67	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	2	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 65	5.00	4.74	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	70/ 78	4.33	4.43	4.45	4.58	3.67	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	62/ 80	4.25	4.33	4.11	4.14	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	20
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						



Course-Section: EDUC 408 0201  
 Title SCNDRY INTRNSHP SEMINA  
 Instructor: OLIVA, LINDA M.  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 572  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1122/1522	3.74	4.42	4.30	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1481/1522	3.25	4.34	4.26	4.34	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1009/1476	3.83	4.43	4.22	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	760/1412	3.47	4.10	4.06	4.11	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	806/1381	3.58	4.28	4.08	4.21	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	988/1500	3.40	4.35	4.18	4.25	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	4.63	4.72	4.65	4.71	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	4.17	4.35	4.58	4.67	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 77	4.33	4.55	4.52	4.60	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 65	5.00	4.74	4.49	4.65	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 78	4.33	4.43	4.45	4.58	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	4.25	4.33	4.11	4.14	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 410 0101  
 Title READ CONTNT AREA I  
 Instructor: NORTH-COLEMAN,  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 573  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	8	10	4.17	980/1522	4.17	4.42	4.30	4.42	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	5	12	4.26	864/1522	4.26	4.34	4.26	4.34	4.26	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	17	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/1285	****	4.52	4.30	4.42	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.43	4.22	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	9	7	3.78	989/1412	3.78	4.10	4.06	4.11	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	11	7	4.14	723/1381	4.14	4.28	4.08	4.21	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	7	10	4.18	850/1500	4.18	4.35	4.18	4.25	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	14	4.61	994/1517	4.61	4.72	4.65	4.71	4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	12	5	4.22	685/1497	4.22	4.24	4.11	4.21	4.22	
-----															
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	669/1440	4.62	4.52	4.45	4.52	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	629/1448	4.86	4.86	4.71	4.75	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	10	11	4.52	576/1436	4.52	4.46	4.29	4.32	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	669/1432	4.48	4.34	4.29	4.34	4.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	175/1221	4.67	3.74	3.93	4.04	4.67	
-----															
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	566/1280	4.29	4.40	4.10	4.28	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	594/1277	4.50	4.61	4.34	4.50	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	532/1269	4.57	4.65	4.31	4.49	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	217/ 854	4.46	4.29	4.02	4.31	4.46	
-----															
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	****/ 47	****	4.77	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	****/ 45	****	4.55	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 39	****	4.92	4.40	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	2	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 35	****	4.56	4.31	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 17	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	22
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 414 0101  
 Title ADOLESCENT LITERATURE  
 Instructor: MURINGANI, NICO  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 574  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1122/1522	4.00	4.42	4.30	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1323/1522	3.60	4.34	4.26	4.34	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	860/1476	4.20	4.43	4.22	4.31	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	430/1412	4.40	4.10	4.06	4.11	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.28	4.08	4.21	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	630/1500	4.40	4.35	4.18	4.25	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.00	4.72	4.65	4.71	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	573/1497	4.33	4.24	4.11	4.21	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1287/1440	3.80	4.52	4.45	4.52	3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1241/1448	4.40	4.86	4.71	4.75	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1350/1436	3.25	4.46	4.29	4.32	3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1036/1432	4.00	4.34	4.29	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1197/1221	2.00	3.74	3.93	4.04	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	718/1280	4.00	4.40	4.10	4.28	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1183/1277	3.33	4.61	4.34	4.50	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	721/1269	4.33	4.65	4.31	4.49	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.29	4.02	4.31	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		5
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	5

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 415 0101  
 Title MATERIALS TCH READ  
 Instructor: YOUNG, PATRICIA  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 575  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	3	1	9	4.00	1122/1522	4.00	4.42	4.30	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	2	10	4.27	864/1522	4.27	4.34	4.26	4.34	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	456/1285	4.57	4.52	4.30	4.42	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	9	4.27	781/1476	4.27	4.43	4.22	4.31	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	2	7	3.80	973/1412	3.80	4.10	4.06	4.11	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	2	8	4.13	723/1381	4.13	4.28	4.08	4.21	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	2	8	4.07	956/1500	4.07	4.35	4.18	4.25	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	837/1517	4.73	4.72	4.65	4.71	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	0	4	4	2	3.33	1346/1497	3.33	4.24	4.11	4.21	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	1094/1440	4.20	4.52	4.45	4.52	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	1131/1448	4.53	4.86	4.71	4.75	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	2	2	9	4.13	980/1436	4.13	4.46	4.29	4.32	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	0	8	3.53	1261/1432	3.53	4.34	4.29	4.34	3.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	5	1	7	3.87	720/1221	3.87	3.74	3.93	4.04	3.87	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	553/1280	4.31	4.40	4.10	4.28	4.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	873/1277	4.15	4.61	4.34	4.50	4.15	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	685/1269	4.38	4.65	4.31	4.49	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	555/ 854	3.83	4.29	4.02	4.31	3.83	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.35	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.55	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.74	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.43	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	4.14	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.77	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.55	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.92	4.40	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.56	4.31	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	10	F 0	Electives 1
				P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				I 0	
				? 0	Other 11

Course-Section: Educ 601 0101  
 Title Human Learning/Cognition  
 Instructor: Oliva, Linda  
 Enrollment: 0  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 7  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	2	5	6	3.71	1321/1522	****	4.69	4.30	4.14	3.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	3	7	3.82	1233/1522	****	4.64	4.26	4.18	3.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	456/1285	****	4.72	4.30	4.22	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	5	1	8	3.71	1222/1476	****	4.58	4.22	4.09	3.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	7	3	5	3.69	1065/1412	****	4.57	4.06	4.01	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	1	10	4.00	806/1381	****	4.28	4.08	3.93	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	6	7	4.00	988/1500	****	4.45	4.18	4.16	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	952/1517	****	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	4	5	1	3.33	1346/1497	****	4.43	4.11	4.02	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	1015/1440	****	4.68	4.45	4.40	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	1140/1448	****	4.95	4.71	4.63	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	3	5	7	4.00	1056/1436	****	4.57	4.29	4.24	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	8	3	5	3.65	1230/1432	****	4.55	4.29	4.23	3.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	5	7	4	3.82	746/1221	****	3.94	3.93	3.86	3.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	6	3	3.71	934/1280	****	4.72	4.10	3.92	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	996/1277	****	4.80	4.34	4.13	3.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	805/1269	****	4.82	4.31	4.04	4.21	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	1	5	1	4	3.73	600/ 854	****	4.55	4.02	3.87	3.73	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.57	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.80	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	4.50	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	246/1522	4.80	4.42	4.30	4.45	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	432/1522	4.60	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.43	4.22	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	430/1412	4.40	4.10	4.06	4.25	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.28	4.08	4.25	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.35	4.18	4.22	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.72	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.24	4.11	4.21	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.52	4.45	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.86	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.46	4.29	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.34	4.29	4.33	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	279/1221	4.50	3.74	3.93	3.83	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.40	4.10	4.24	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.61	4.34	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.65	4.31	4.51	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	252/ 854	4.40	4.29	4.02	4.08	4.40	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.33	4.35	4.39	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.35	4.58	4.76	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.55	4.52	4.70	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.74	4.49	4.71	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.43	4.45	4.66	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	4.38	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	32/ 47	4.40	4.77	4.41	4.40	4.40	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	4.55	4.30	4.49	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	21/ 39	4.60	4.92	4.40	4.78	4.60	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	21/ 35	4.20	4.56	4.31	4.71	4.20	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	22/ 34	4.00	4.50	4.30	4.82	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 602 0101  
 Title INSTRUCTIONAL SYS DEV  
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 577  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	4.90	4.34	4.26	4.29	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	4.90	4.43	4.22	4.31	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	898/1497	4.36	4.24	4.11	4.21	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	4.95	4.52	4.45	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	4.95	4.86	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	4.85	4.46	4.29	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1432	4.95	4.34	4.29	4.33	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1221	4.00	3.74	3.93	3.83	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1280	4.80	4.40	4.10	4.24	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	4.85	4.61	4.34	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	4.70	4.65	4.31	4.51	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	4.50	4.29	4.02	4.08	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 602 0201  
 Title INSTRUCTIONAL SYS DEV  
 Instructor: SMITH JR, MURDU  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 578  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	201/1522	4.90	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.52	4.30	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	178/1476	4.90	4.43	4.22	4.31	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	430/1412	4.40	4.10	4.06	4.25	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	86/1381	4.90	4.28	4.08	4.25	4.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	160/1500	4.80	4.35	4.18	4.22	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	994/1517	4.60	4.72	4.65	4.73	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	223/1497	4.36	4.24	4.11	4.21	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	192/1440	4.95	4.52	4.45	4.48	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	494/1448	4.95	4.86	4.71	4.80	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	383/1436	4.85	4.46	4.29	4.37	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	161/1432	4.95	4.34	4.29	4.33	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	1064/1221	4.00	3.74	3.93	3.83	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	324/1280	4.80	4.40	4.10	4.24	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	442/1277	4.85	4.61	4.34	4.52	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	1	0	8	4.40	671/1269	4.70	4.65	4.31	4.51	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	0	5	3	4.00	426/ 854	4.50	4.29	4.02	4.08	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: EDUC 607 0101  
 Title PROCESSES & ACQ READIN  
 Instructor: SHELTON, NANCY  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 579  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	959/1522	4.20	4.42	4.30	4.45	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	702/1522	4.40	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1248/1285	3.00	4.52	4.30	4.31	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1281/1476	3.60	4.43	4.22	4.31	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	973/1412	3.80	4.10	4.06	4.25	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.28	4.08	4.25	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1357/1500	3.40	4.35	4.18	4.22	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	994/1517	4.60	4.72	4.65	4.73	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	506/1497	4.40	4.24	4.11	4.21	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1359/1440	3.50	4.52	4.45	4.48	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.86	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	1350/1436	3.25	4.46	4.29	4.37	3.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1390/1432	2.75	4.34	4.29	4.33	2.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1197/1221	2.00	3.74	3.93	3.83	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	624/1280	4.20	4.40	4.10	4.24	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	527/1277	4.60	4.61	4.34	4.52	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1002/1269	3.80	4.65	4.31	4.51	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.29	4.02	4.08	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 608 0101  
 Title INSTRUCT READING  
 Instructor: SHELTON, NANCY (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 580  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	814/1522	4.33	4.42	4.30	4.45	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1080/1522	4.00	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1160/1285	3.50	4.52	4.30	4.31	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1245/1476	3.67	4.43	4.22	4.31	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	1375/1412	2.67	4.10	4.06	4.25	2.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1286/1381	3.00	4.28	4.08	4.25	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1236/1500	3.67	4.35	4.18	4.22	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	932/1517	4.67	4.72	4.65	4.73	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	573/1497	4.17	4.24	4.11	4.21	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1331/1440	3.67	4.52	4.45	4.48	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1001/1448	4.67	4.86	4.71	4.80	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1056/1436	4.00	4.46	4.29	4.37	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1224/1432	3.67	4.34	4.29	4.33	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1148/1221	2.67	3.74	3.93	3.83	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	959/1280	3.67	4.40	4.10	4.24	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	470/1277	4.67	4.61	4.34	4.52	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	461/1269	4.67	4.65	4.31	4.51	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.29	4.02	4.08	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 2
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 1
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	3
			? 1		

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 608 0101  
 Title INSTRUCT READING  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 581  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	814/1522	4.33	4.42	4.30	4.45	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1080/1522	4.00	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1160/1285	3.50	4.52	4.30	4.31	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1245/1476	3.67	4.43	4.22	4.31	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	1375/1412	2.67	4.10	4.06	4.25	2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1286/1381	3.00	4.28	4.08	4.25	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1236/1500	3.67	4.35	4.18	4.22	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	932/1517	4.67	4.72	4.65	4.73	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	898/1497	4.17	4.24	4.11	4.21	4.17

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	959/1280	3.67	4.40	4.10	4.24	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	470/1277	4.67	4.61	4.34	4.52	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	461/1269	4.67	4.65	4.31	4.51	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.29	4.02	4.08	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 622 0101  
 Title INSTRUC STRGY ELEM MAT  
 Instructor: KINACH, BARBARA  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 582  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	492/1522	4.60	4.42	4.30	4.45	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	432/1522	4.60	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1285	****	4.52	4.30	4.31	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	945/1476	4.11	4.43	4.22	4.31	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	594/1412	4.22	4.10	4.06	4.25	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	519/1381	4.33	4.28	4.08	4.25	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.35	4.18	4.22	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	802/1517	4.75	4.72	4.65	4.73	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	534/1497	4.38	4.24	4.11	4.21	4.38	
Lecture															
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1448	****	4.86	4.71	4.80	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1432	****	4.34	4.29	4.33	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1221	****	3.74	3.93	3.83	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	530/1280	4.33	4.40	4.10	4.24	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	470/1277	4.67	4.61	4.34	4.52	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	547/1269	4.56	4.65	4.31	4.51	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	141/ 854	4.67	4.29	4.02	4.08	4.67	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.77	4.41	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.55	4.30	4.49	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.92	4.40	4.78	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 625 0101  
 Title TEACH READ WRIT ESL I  
 Instructor: SHIN, SARAH  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 583  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	779/1522	4.36	4.42	4.30	4.45	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	395/1522	4.64	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	478/1285	4.56	4.52	4.30	4.31	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	613/1476	4.42	4.43	4.22	4.31	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	629/1412	4.18	4.10	4.06	4.25	4.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	382/1381	4.45	4.28	4.08	4.25	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	670/1500	4.36	4.35	4.18	4.22	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.72	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	481/1497	4.43	4.24	4.11	4.21	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	172/1440	4.92	4.52	4.45	4.48	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.86	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	295/1436	4.75	4.46	4.29	4.37	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	745/1432	4.42	4.34	4.29	4.33	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	3	0	3	1	4	3.27	1004/1221	3.27	3.74	3.93	3.83	3.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	390/1280	4.50	4.40	4.10	4.24	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	290/1277	4.83	4.61	4.34	4.52	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.65	4.31	4.51	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	319/ 854	4.27	4.29	4.02	4.08	4.27	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 644 0101  
 Title LING/ESOL EDUCATORS  
 Instructor: SHIN, SARAH  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 584  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	433/1522	4.67	4.42	4.30	4.45	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	488/1522	4.56	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	7	10	4.44	602/1285	4.44	4.52	4.30	4.31	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	924/1476	4.13	4.43	4.22	4.31	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	393/1412	4.44	4.10	4.06	4.25	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	623/1381	4.24	4.28	4.08	4.25	4.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	263/1500	4.71	4.35	4.18	4.22	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	645/1517	4.83	4.72	4.65	4.73	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	481/1497	4.43	4.24	4.11	4.21	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	604/1440	4.67	4.52	4.45	4.48	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	821/1448	4.78	4.86	4.71	4.80	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	539/1436	4.56	4.46	4.29	4.37	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	0	2	12	4.35	802/1432	4.35	4.34	4.29	4.33	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	2	1	6	8	4.00	606/1221	4.00	3.74	3.93	3.83	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	357/1280	4.56	4.40	4.10	4.24	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	743/1277	4.33	4.61	4.34	4.52	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	410/1269	4.72	4.65	4.31	4.51	4.72	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	3	0	3	1	3	3.10	771/ 854	3.10	4.29	4.02	4.08	3.10	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Graduate 6
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	18
			? 1		

Course-Section: EDUC 650 0101  
 Title EDUC IN CULTURAL PERSP  
 Instructor: MURPHY, JOYCE A  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 585  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	4	11	4.26	889/1522	4.26	4.42	4.30	4.45	4.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	670/1522	4.42	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.52	4.30	4.31	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	11	4.21	838/1476	4.21	4.43	4.22	4.31	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	366/1412	4.47	4.10	4.06	4.25	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	482/1381	4.37	4.28	4.08	4.25	4.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	3	10	4.11	935/1500	4.11	4.35	4.18	4.22	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	837/1517	4.74	4.72	4.65	4.73	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	525/1497	4.38	4.24	4.11	4.21	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1440	****	4.52	4.45	4.48	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1448	****	4.86	4.71	4.80	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1436	****	4.46	4.29	4.37	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1432	****	4.34	4.29	4.33	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/1221	****	3.74	3.93	3.83	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	343/1280	4.58	4.40	4.10	4.24	4.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	398/1277	4.74	4.61	4.34	4.52	4.74	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	3	1	15	4.63	485/1269	4.63	4.65	4.31	4.51	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	153/ 854	4.63	4.29	4.02	4.08	4.63	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.35	4.58	4.76	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	A 16	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 9
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 655 0101  
 Title TCH READ WRIT ESL II  
 Instructor: CRANDALL, JOANN  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 586  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	77/1522	4.94	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.52	4.30	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	167/1476	4.82	4.43	4.22	4.31	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	61/1412	4.94	4.10	4.06	4.25	4.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	108/1381	4.83	4.28	4.08	4.25	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	16	4.78	190/1500	4.78	4.35	4.18	4.22	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	645/1517	4.83	4.72	4.65	4.73	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	112/1497	4.88	4.24	4.11	4.21	4.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	304/1440	4.83	4.52	4.45	4.48	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.86	4.71	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	141/1436	4.89	4.46	4.29	4.37	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	187/1432	4.89	4.34	4.29	4.33	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	408/1221	4.33	3.74	3.93	3.83	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	170/1280	4.83	4.40	4.10	4.24	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	594/1277	4.50	4.61	4.34	4.52	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	361/1269	4.78	4.65	4.31	4.51	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	287/ 854	4.33	4.29	4.02	4.08	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	8	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	10	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						



Course-Section: EDUC 658 0101  
 Title READING CONTENT AREA I  
 Instructor: NORTH-COLEMAN,  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 587  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	869/1522	4.29	4.42	4.30	4.45	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	670/1522	4.43	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1285	****	4.52	4.30	4.31	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	913/1476	4.14	4.43	4.22	4.31	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	6	1	4	3.43	1213/1412	3.43	4.10	4.06	4.25	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	556/1381	4.31	4.28	4.08	4.25	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	600/1500	4.43	4.35	4.18	4.22	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	3	4.23	1278/1517	4.23	4.72	4.65	4.73	4.23	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	731/1497	4.18	4.24	4.11	4.21	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	565/1440	4.69	4.52	4.45	4.48	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	629/1448	4.86	4.86	4.71	4.80	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	772/1436	4.36	4.46	4.29	4.37	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	914/1432	4.21	4.34	4.29	4.33	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	582/1221	4.08	3.74	3.93	3.83	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	694/1280	4.07	4.40	4.10	4.24	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	547/1277	4.57	4.61	4.34	4.52	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	3	0	10	4.29	756/1269	4.29	4.65	4.31	4.51	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	303/ 854	4.31	4.29	4.02	4.08	4.31	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	4.77	4.41	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 45	****	4.55	4.30	4.49	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.92	4.40	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.56	4.31	4.71	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.82	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 666 8720  
 Title CROSSCULT COMM/ESOL  
 Instructor: SHIN, SARAH  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 588  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	158/1522	4.92	4.42	4.30	4.45	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	179/1522	4.83	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.52	4.30	4.31	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	162/1476	4.83	4.43	4.22	4.31	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	231/1412	4.67	4.10	4.06	4.25	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	519/1381	4.33	4.28	4.08	4.25	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	144/1500	4.83	4.35	4.18	4.22	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	645/1517	4.83	4.72	4.65	4.73	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	506/1497	4.40	4.24	4.11	4.21	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	304/1440	4.83	4.52	4.45	4.48	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.86	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	188/1436	4.83	4.46	4.29	4.37	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	632/1432	4.50	4.34	4.29	4.33	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	5	0	3	3.44	933/1221	3.44	3.74	3.93	3.83	3.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	390/1280	4.50	4.40	4.10	4.24	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	205/1277	4.92	4.61	4.34	4.52	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	299/1269	4.83	4.65	4.31	4.51	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	141/ 854	4.67	4.29	4.02	4.08	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.35	4.58	4.76	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.55	4.52	4.70	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.74	4.49	4.71	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.43	4.45	4.66	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	4.38	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.82	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.68	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.79	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	5	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
			Required for Majors	0	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	Major
			Other	12	Non-major
					1

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 669 0101  
 Title ASSESS READING  
 Instructor: SMALL, SUE  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 589  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1122/1522	4.00	4.42	4.30	4.45	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1080/1522	3.67	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	4.67	4.43	4.22	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	339/1412	4.13	4.10	4.06	4.25	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	806/1381	4.17	4.28	4.08	4.25	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1500	4.61	4.35	4.18	4.22	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.39	4.72	4.65	4.73	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1277/1497	3.56	4.24	4.11	4.21	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1359/1440	3.64	4.52	4.45	4.48	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1157/1448	4.69	4.86	4.71	4.80	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1282/1436	3.47	4.46	4.29	4.37	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1270/1432	3.36	4.34	4.29	4.33	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1221	3.80	3.74	3.93	3.83	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	718/1280	3.75	4.40	4.10	4.24	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	4.58	4.61	4.34	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	4.83	4.65	4.31	4.51	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	4.70	4.29	4.02	4.08	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.77	4.41	4.40	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	30/ 45	4.00	4.55	4.30	4.49	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.92	4.40	4.78	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	4.50	4.30	4.82	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 669 0201  
 Title ASSESS READING  
 Instructor: SMALL, SUE ELLE  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 590  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1122/1522	4.00	4.42	4.30	4.45	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	3	1	3.33	1419/1522	3.67	4.34	4.26	4.29	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1285	****	4.52	4.30	4.31	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	703/1476	4.67	4.43	4.22	4.31	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1013/1412	4.13	4.10	4.06	4.25	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	519/1381	4.17	4.28	4.08	4.25	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	809/1500	4.61	4.35	4.18	4.22	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	767/1517	4.39	4.72	4.65	4.73	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	5	0	3.63	1227/1497	3.56	4.24	4.11	4.21	3.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1297/1440	3.64	4.52	4.45	4.48	3.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	548/1448	4.69	4.86	4.71	4.80	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	3	1	3.44	1301/1436	3.47	4.46	4.29	4.37	3.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	2	1	3.22	1340/1432	3.36	4.34	4.29	4.33	3.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	2	0	1	2	0	2.60	1154/1221	3.80	3.74	3.93	3.83	2.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1031/1280	3.75	4.40	4.10	4.24	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	867/1277	4.58	4.61	4.34	4.52	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	461/1269	4.83	4.65	4.31	4.51	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	252/ 854	4.70	4.29	4.02	4.08	4.40	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	5.00	4.77	4.41	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 45	4.00	4.55	4.30	4.49	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	5.00	4.92	4.40	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.56	4.31	4.71	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	5.00	4.50	4.30	4.82	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 678 0101  
 Title INST STRAT/DIV NEEDS  
 Instructor: BERGE, NANCY B  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 591  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	5	11	4.14	1012/1522	3.86	4.42	4.30	4.45	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	7	9	4.00	1080/1522	4.07	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	16	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1285	****	4.52	4.30	4.31	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	5	10	4.05	987/1476	4.02	4.43	4.22	4.31	4.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	6	7	3.81	973/1412	4.24	4.10	4.06	4.25	3.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	7	9	4.10	753/1381	3.98	4.28	4.08	4.25	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	2	2	14	4.35	680/1500	4.39	4.35	4.18	4.22	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	942/1517	4.57	4.72	4.65	4.73	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	8	8	1	3.59	1246/1497	3.79	4.24	4.11	4.21	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	3	12	4.39	946/1440	4.39	4.52	4.45	4.48	4.39	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	548/1448	4.74	4.86	4.71	4.80	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	2	6	8	4.06	1029/1436	4.23	4.46	4.29	4.37	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	4	4	8	3.94	1090/1432	3.97	4.34	4.29	4.33	3.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	2	1	4	7	4	3.56	879/1221	3.78	3.74	3.93	3.83	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	5	9	4.00	718/1280	4.08	4.40	4.10	4.24	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	5	5	9	4.05	916/1277	4.03	4.61	4.34	4.52	4.05	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	2	5	3	10	4.05	864/1269	4.03	4.65	4.31	4.51	4.05	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	2	0	8	4	6	3.60	652/ 854	3.47	4.29	4.02	4.08	3.60	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.35	4.58	4.76	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/ 77	****	4.55	4.52	4.70	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 65	****	4.74	4.49	4.71	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 78	****	4.43	4.45	4.66	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	4.38	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		Graduate 9
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00 15	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	21
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 678 0201  
 Title INST STRAT/DIV NEEDS  
 Instructor: BERGE, NANCY  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 592  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1376/1522	3.86	4.42	4.30	4.45	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	986/1522	4.07	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1285	****	4.52	4.30	4.31	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1009/1476	4.02	4.43	4.22	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	231/1412	4.24	4.10	4.06	4.25	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	977/1381	3.98	4.28	4.08	4.25	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	600/1500	4.39	4.35	4.18	4.22	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1080/1517	4.57	4.72	4.65	4.73	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	898/1497	3.79	4.24	4.11	4.21	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	931/1440	4.39	4.52	4.45	4.48	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	1072/1448	4.74	4.86	4.71	4.80	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	720/1436	4.23	4.46	4.29	4.37	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1036/1432	3.97	4.34	4.29	4.33	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	606/1221	3.78	3.74	3.93	3.83	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	644/1280	4.08	4.40	4.10	4.24	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	930/1277	4.03	4.61	4.34	4.52	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	875/1269	4.03	4.65	4.31	4.51	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	726/ 854	3.47	4.29	4.02	4.08	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 688 0101  
 Title: METHODOLOGY TEACH ESL  
 Instructor: NELSON, JOHN E.  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 593  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.34	4.26	4.29	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	120/1285	4.92	4.52	4.30	4.31	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	0	11	4.75	226/1476	4.75	4.43	4.22	4.31	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	384/1412	4.45	4.10	4.06	4.25	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	263/1381	4.58	4.28	4.08	4.25	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	211/1500	4.75	4.35	4.18	4.22	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	1120/1517	4.45	4.72	4.65	4.73	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	147/1497	4.80	4.24	4.11	4.21	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.52	4.45	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.86	4.71	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	98/1436	4.92	4.46	4.29	4.37	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	129/1432	4.92	4.34	4.29	4.33	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	3	0	0	0	2	2.60	1154/1221	2.60	3.74	3.93	3.83	2.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	222/1280	4.75	4.40	4.10	4.24	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	375/1277	4.75	4.61	4.34	4.52	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	200/1269	4.92	4.65	4.31	4.51	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	194/ 854	4.50	4.29	4.02	4.08	4.50
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.43	4.45	4.66	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 1		

Course-Section: EDUC 771 0101  
 Title RESEARCH DESIGNS IN ED  
 Instructor: OLIA, NEZHAT  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 594  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	433/1522	4.19	4.42	4.30	4.45	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	787/1522	3.84	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	4.21	4.52	4.30	4.31	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1476	4.50	4.43	4.22	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1412	4.50	4.10	4.06	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1381	4.44	4.28	4.08	4.25	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1500	4.71	4.35	4.18	4.22	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1517	4.91	4.72	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1497	4.25	4.24	4.11	4.21	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	604/1440	4.30	4.52	4.45	4.48	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1448	4.91	4.86	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	793/1436	3.89	4.46	4.29	4.37	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	820/1432	3.84	4.34	4.29	4.33	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	899/1221	2.85	3.74	3.93	3.83	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	530/1280	3.93	4.40	4.10	4.24	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	470/1277	4.33	4.61	4.34	4.52	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	461/1269	4.48	4.65	4.31	4.51	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	141/ 854	3.93	4.29	4.02	4.08	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: EDUC 771 8720  
 Title RESEARCH DESIGNS IN ED  
 Instructor: OLIA, NEZHAT  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 595  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	5	5	3.71	1321/1522	4.19	4.42	4.30	4.45	3.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	7	5	2	3.35	1415/1522	3.84	4.34	4.26	4.29	3.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	2	4	0	3.43	1193/1285	4.21	4.52	4.30	4.31	3.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	7	5	4.00	1009/1476	4.50	4.43	4.22	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	5	7	4.00	760/1412	4.50	4.10	4.06	4.25	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	7	5	3.88	953/1381	4.44	4.28	4.08	4.25	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	615/1500	4.71	4.35	4.18	4.22	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	691/1517	4.91	4.72	4.65	4.73	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	4	4	1	3.50	1277/1497	4.25	4.24	4.11	4.21	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	7	4	6	3.94	1225/1440	4.30	4.52	4.45	4.48	3.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	710/1448	4.91	4.86	4.71	4.80	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	5	6	2	3.44	1305/1436	3.89	4.46	4.29	4.37	3.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	4	6	3	3.35	1316/1432	3.84	4.34	4.29	4.33	3.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	5	1	2	1	1	2.20	1194/1221	2.85	3.74	3.93	3.83	2.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	7	5	3	3.53	1022/1280	3.93	4.40	4.10	4.24	3.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	5	3	8	4.00	930/1277	4.33	4.61	4.34	4.52	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	1	1	3	11	4.29	749/1269	4.48	4.65	4.31	4.51	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	2	0	4	2	2	3.20	747/ 854	3.93	4.29	4.02	4.08	3.20	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	4.33	4.35	4.39	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.61	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	64/ 79	4.40	4.35	4.58	4.76	4.40	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	58/ 77	4.17	4.55	4.52	4.70	4.17	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	49/ 65	4.33	4.74	4.49	4.71	4.33	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	68/ 78	3.83	4.43	4.45	4.66	3.83	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	46/ 80	4.17	4.33	4.11	4.38	4.17	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	4.77	4.41	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.55	4.30	4.49	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.92	4.40	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 35	****	4.56	4.31	4.71	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.82	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.68	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.79	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.83	****	

Course-Section: EDUC 771 8720  
 Title RESEARCH DESIGNS IN ED  
 Instructor: OLIA, NEZHAT  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 595  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 791P 0101  
 Title  
 Instructor: MURPHY, JOYCE A  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 596  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	605/1522	4.50	4.42	4.30	4.45	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	255/1522	4.75	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	366/1285	4.67	4.52	4.30	4.31	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	792/1476	4.25	4.43	4.22	4.31	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	948/1412	3.83	4.10	4.06	4.25	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	763/1381	4.08	4.28	4.08	4.25	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	1	5	3.67	1236/1500	3.67	4.35	4.18	4.22	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	855/1517	4.73	4.72	4.65	4.73	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	731/1497	4.18	4.24	4.11	4.21	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1440	****	4.52	4.45	4.48	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1448	****	4.86	4.71	4.80	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1436	****	4.46	4.29	4.37	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1432	****	4.34	4.29	4.33	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1133/1221	2.75	3.74	3.93	3.83	2.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	433/1280	4.45	4.40	4.10	4.24	4.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	498/1277	4.64	4.61	4.34	4.52	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	555/1269	4.55	4.65	4.31	4.51	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	252/ 854	4.40	4.29	4.02	4.08	4.40	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.77	4.41	4.40	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	5	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 791S 0101  
 Title  
 Instructor: ANAND, SUPREET  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 597  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	380/1522	4.71	4.42	4.30	4.45	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	787/1522	4.33	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.52	4.30	4.31	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.43	4.22	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	299/1412	4.57	4.10	4.06	4.25	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	713/1381	4.14	4.28	4.08	4.25	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	483/1500	4.50	4.35	4.18	4.22	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	600/1517	4.86	4.72	4.65	4.73	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	312/1497	4.60	4.24	4.11	4.21	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	716/1440	4.57	4.52	4.45	4.48	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1097/1448	4.57	4.86	4.71	4.80	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	514/1436	4.57	4.46	4.29	4.37	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	558/1432	4.57	4.34	4.29	4.33	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	899/1221	3.50	3.74	3.93	3.83	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	170/1280	4.83	4.40	4.10	4.24	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	594/1277	4.50	4.61	4.34	4.52	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	299/1269	4.83	4.65	4.31	4.51	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	779/ 854	3.00	4.29	4.02	4.08	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 792 8020  
 Title ISD INTERNSHIP  
 Instructor: FRICK, JERRI  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 598  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1122/1522	3.96	4.42	4.30	4.45	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	4.53	4.34	4.26	4.29	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	4.68	4.43	4.22	4.31	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	806/1381	4.13	4.28	4.08	4.25	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1500	4.51	4.35	4.18	4.22	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	4.93	4.72	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	898/1497	4.15	4.24	4.11	4.21	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	4.70	4.52	4.45	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	4.84	4.86	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	4.69	4.46	4.29	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1432	4.50	4.34	4.29	4.33	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1064/1221	3.85	3.74	3.93	3.83	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	718/1280	4.17	4.40	4.10	4.24	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	930/1277	4.37	4.61	4.34	4.52	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	4.65	4.65	4.31	4.51	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	426/ 854	3.98	4.29	4.02	4.08	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	7	6	4.00	1122/1522	3.96	4.42	4.30	4.45	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	522/1522	4.53	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	****	4.52	4.30	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	378/1476	4.68	4.43	4.22	4.31	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	430/1412	4.28	4.10	4.06	4.25	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	372/1381	4.13	4.28	4.08	4.25	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	3	12	4.47	527/1500	4.51	4.35	4.18	4.22	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1517	4.93	4.72	4.65	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	643/1497	4.15	4.24	4.11	4.21	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	452/1440	4.70	4.52	4.45	4.48	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	548/1448	4.84	4.86	4.71	4.80	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	383/1436	4.69	4.46	4.29	4.37	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	632/1432	4.50	4.34	4.29	4.33	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	246/1221	3.85	3.74	3.93	3.83	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	477/1280	4.17	4.40	4.10	4.24	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	442/1277	4.37	4.61	4.34	4.52	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	361/1269	4.65	4.65	4.31	4.51	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	426/ 854	3.98	4.29	4.02	4.08	4.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	4.33	4.35	4.39	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.61	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	2	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	47/ 79	4.71	4.35	4.58	4.76	4.71
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	4.55	4.52	4.70	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	28/ 65	4.90	4.74	4.49	4.71	4.90
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	38/ 78	4.70	4.43	4.45	4.66	4.70
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	23/ 80	4.80	4.33	4.11	4.38	4.80
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	4.77	4.41	4.40	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 45	****	4.55	4.30	4.49	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	4.92	4.40	4.78	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.56	4.31	4.71	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.82	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.68	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.79	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.83	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.92	****

Course-Section: EDUC 792 8720  
 Title ISD INTERNSHIP  
 Instructor: FRICK, JERRI  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 599  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	8	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 792 8721  
 Title ISD INTERNSHIP  
 Instructor: MURDOCK, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 600  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	4	1	6	7	3.89	1229/1522	3.96	4.42	4.30	4.45	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	1	6	8	4.06	1053/1522	4.53	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	14	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1285	****	4.52	4.30	4.31	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	3	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	597/1476	4.68	4.43	4.22	4.31	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	655/1412	4.28	4.10	4.06	4.25	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	0	3	3	8	3.94	898/1381	4.13	4.28	4.08	4.25	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	0	8	7	4.06	961/1500	4.51	4.35	4.18	4.22	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	767/1517	4.93	4.72	4.65	4.73	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	731/1497	4.15	4.24	4.11	4.21	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	969/1440	4.70	4.52	4.45	4.48	4.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	1048/1448	4.84	4.86	4.71	4.80	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	751/1436	4.69	4.46	4.29	4.37	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	1036/1432	4.50	4.34	4.29	4.33	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	10	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	606/1221	3.85	3.74	3.93	3.83	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	3	3	9	4.12	677/1280	4.17	4.40	4.10	4.24	4.12	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	1	2	12	4.41	682/1277	4.37	4.61	4.34	4.52	4.41	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	2	3	2	10	4.18	824/1269	4.65	4.65	4.31	4.51	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	3	0	0	6	8	3.94	485/ 854	3.98	4.29	4.02	4.08	3.94	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 79	4.71	4.35	4.58	4.76	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 77	5.00	4.55	4.52	4.70	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 65	4.90	4.74	4.49	4.71	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 78	4.70	4.43	4.45	4.66	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 80	4.80	4.33	4.11	4.38	****	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: EDUC 792L 0101  
 Title  
 Instructor: STEIN, HOLLIS G  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 601  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	255/1522	4.75	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.52	4.30	4.31	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.43	4.22	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.10	4.06	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.28	4.08	4.25	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.35	4.18	4.22	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	802/1517	4.75	4.72	4.65	4.73	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.24	4.11	4.21	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.52	4.45	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.86	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.46	4.29	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.34	4.29	4.33	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	899/1221	3.50	3.74	3.93	3.83	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.40	4.10	4.24	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.61	4.34	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.65	4.31	4.51	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.29	4.02	4.08	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 793 2301  
 Title INTERNSHIP IN EDUCATIO  
 Instructor: ZONGKER, SHIRLE  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 602  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	320/1522	4.75	4.42	4.30	4.45	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	395/1522	4.64	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.52	4.30	4.31	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	207/1476	4.78	4.43	4.22	4.31	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	621/1412	4.20	4.10	4.06	4.25	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	331/1381	4.50	4.28	4.08	4.25	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	2	0	3	5	4.10	935/1500	4.10	4.35	4.18	4.22	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	438/1517	4.92	4.72	4.65	4.73	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	573/1497	4.33	4.24	4.11	4.21	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	452/1440	4.75	4.52	4.45	4.48	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	548/1448	4.89	4.86	4.71	4.80	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	151/1436	4.88	4.46	4.29	4.37	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	784/1432	4.38	4.34	4.29	4.33	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	500/1221	4.20	3.74	3.93	3.83	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.40	4.10	4.24	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.61	4.34	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.65	4.31	4.51	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	402/ 854	4.13	4.29	4.02	4.08	4.13	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.35	4.58	4.76	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	4.55	4.52	4.70	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.74	4.49	4.71	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	4.43	4.45	4.66	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.33	4.11	4.38	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.77	4.41	4.40	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 45	****	4.55	4.30	4.49	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.92	4.40	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.56	4.31	4.71	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.82	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.68	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.79	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.83	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	10	
?	1			

Course-Section: EDUC 794 0101  
 Title ISD PROJECT SEMINAR  
 Instructor: ~~KINERNEY, DONNA~~ Joan Shin  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 603  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	320/1522	4.75	4.42	4.30	4.45	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	149/1522	4.88	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	****	4.52	4.30	4.31	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	140/1476	4.88	4.43	4.22	4.31	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	167/1412	4.75	4.10	4.06	4.25	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	102/1381	4.86	4.28	4.08	4.25	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.35	4.18	4.22	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.72	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	333/1497	4.57	4.24	4.11	4.21	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1440	4.88	4.52	4.45	4.48	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	575/1448	4.88	4.86	4.71	4.80	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	151/1436	4.88	4.46	4.29	4.37	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	632/1432	4.50	4.34	4.29	4.33	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	832/1221	3.67	3.74	3.93	3.83	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.40	4.10	4.24	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	594/1277	4.50	4.61	4.34	4.52	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	721/1269	4.33	4.65	4.31	4.51	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	88/ 854	4.80	4.29	4.02	4.08	4.80	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	67/ 79	4.00	4.35	4.58	4.76	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	4.55	4.52	4.70	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.74	4.49	4.71	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	49/ 78	4.50	4.43	4.45	4.66	4.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	62/ 80	3.50	4.33	4.11	4.38	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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