

Course-Section: EDUC 310 0101
 Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION
 Instructor: OLIVA, LINDA M.
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 575
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	4	7	3.93	1245/1649	4.28	4.44	4.28	4.27	3.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	4	6	3.93	1197/1648	4.16	4.38	4.23	4.18	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	401/1375	4.58	4.54	4.27	4.22	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	1	3	7	3.93	1175/1595	4.01	4.42	4.20	4.21	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	1	7	3.67	1139/1533	3.70	4.21	4.04	4.05	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	4	6	3.93	980/1512	4.17	4.35	4.10	4.11	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	4	6	3.87	1204/1623	4.04	4.34	4.16	4.08	3.87	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	977/1646	4.68	4.76	4.69	4.67	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	0	4	2	2	3.20	1463/1621	4.04	4.18	4.06	4.02	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	0	2	4	5	3.77	1398/1568	4.06	4.52	4.43	4.39	3.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	1273/1572	4.65	4.85	4.70	4.64	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	0	3	1	7	3.85	1251/1564	4.24	4.48	4.28	4.25	3.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	1121/1559	4.23	4.37	4.29	4.23	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	0	6	1	3	3.25	1160/1352	3.91	4.09	3.98	3.97	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	901/1384	4.58	4.51	4.08	4.11	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	1	0	5	3.88	1042/1382	4.63	4.73	4.29	4.37	3.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	654/1368	4.83	4.73	4.30	4.39	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	578/ 948	4.14	4.36	3.95	4.00	3.80	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	282/ 555	4.60	4.64	4.29	4.22	4.60	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.82	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	24/ 52	4.31	4.64	4.06	3.59	4.67	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	34/ 48	3.68	4.22	4.09	4.21	3.83	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	14/ 39	4.57	4.60	4.47	4.43	4.83	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	3	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 39	4.00	4.36	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	3	1	0	0	5	1	3.71	200/ 312	3.82	3.95	3.68	3.60	3.71	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 310 0201
 Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION
 Instructor: BOURNE, BARBARA
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 576
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	1	9	4.31	912/1649	4.28	4.44	4.28	4.27	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	1010/1648	4.16	4.38	4.23	4.18	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	296/1375	4.58	4.54	4.27	4.22	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1067/1595	4.01	4.42	4.20	4.21	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	3	4	3.54	1228/1533	3.70	4.21	4.04	4.05	3.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	782/1512	4.17	4.35	4.10	4.11	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	2	6	3.85	1216/1623	4.04	4.34	4.16	4.08	3.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1166/1646	4.68	4.76	4.69	4.67	4.54	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	374/1621	4.04	4.18	4.06	4.02	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	3	7	4.15	1198/1568	4.06	4.52	4.43	4.39	4.15	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	1241/1572	4.65	4.85	4.70	4.64	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	801/1564	4.24	4.48	4.28	4.25	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	1	9	4.31	931/1559	4.23	4.37	4.29	4.23	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	805/1352	3.91	4.09	3.98	3.97	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1384	4.58	4.51	4.08	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1382	4.63	4.73	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1368	4.83	4.73	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	330/ 948	4.14	4.36	3.95	4.00	4.29	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	5.00	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	4.60	4.64	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 88	****	4.61	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.63	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 81	****	4.47	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	4.53	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.82	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	2	6	3.69	37/ 52	4.31	4.64	4.06	3.59	3.69	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	1	2	2	2	6	3.77	36/ 48	3.68	4.22	4.09	4.21	3.77	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	4	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	20/ 39	4.57	4.60	4.47	4.43	4.56	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	3	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	27/ 39	4.00	4.36	4.38	4.32	4.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	3	0	2	1	3	4	3.90	174/ 312	3.82	3.95	3.68	3.60	3.90	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: EDUC 310 0201
 Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION
 Instructor: BOURNE, BARBARA
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 576
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: EDUC 310 0301
 Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION
 Instructor: GAURIN, ADELL A
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 577
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	510/1649	4.28	4.44	4.28	4.27	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	702/1648	4.16	4.38	4.23	4.18	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	733/1375	4.58	4.54	4.27	4.22	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	996/1595	4.01	4.42	4.20	4.21	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	915/1533	3.70	4.21	4.04	4.05	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	522/1512	4.17	4.35	4.10	4.11	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	635/1623	4.04	4.34	4.16	4.08	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	881/1646	4.68	4.76	4.69	4.67	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	483/1621	4.04	4.18	4.06	4.02	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1121/1568	4.06	4.52	4.43	4.39	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1572	4.65	4.85	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	651/1564	4.24	4.48	4.28	4.25	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	861/1559	4.23	4.37	4.29	4.23	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	263/1352	3.91	4.09	3.98	3.97	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	165/1384	4.58	4.51	4.08	4.11	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1382	4.63	4.73	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1368	4.83	4.73	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	310/ 948	4.14	4.36	3.95	4.00	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	5.00	4.12	3.89	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	4.60	4.64	4.29	4.22	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	28/ 52	4.31	4.64	4.06	3.59	4.57	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	39/ 48	3.68	4.22	4.09	4.21	3.43	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	23/ 39	4.57	4.60	4.47	4.43	4.33	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	2	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	27/ 39	4.00	4.36	4.38	4.32	4.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	2	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	181/ 312	3.82	3.95	3.68	3.60	3.83	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 311 0101
 Title PSYC FOUNDATION OF EDU
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 578
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	4	7	5	3.94	1236/1649	3.97	4.44	4.28	4.27	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	1054/1648	4.32	4.38	4.23	4.18	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	665/1375	4.44	4.54	4.27	4.22	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	672/1595	4.45	4.42	4.20	4.21	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	3	3	5	5	3.75	1065/1533	3.88	4.21	4.04	4.05	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	8	6	4.19	764/1512	4.27	4.35	4.10	4.11	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	3	9	4.18	904/1623	4.45	4.34	4.16	4.08	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	465/1646	4.92	4.76	4.69	4.67	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	1123/1621	4.02	4.18	4.06	4.02	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	891/1568	4.51	4.52	4.43	4.39	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	1022/1572	4.74	4.85	4.70	4.64	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	570/1564	4.57	4.48	4.28	4.25	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	881/1559	4.34	4.37	4.29	4.23	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	556/1352	4.16	4.09	3.98	3.97	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	326/1384	4.66	4.51	4.08	4.11	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1382	4.88	4.73	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1368	4.94	4.73	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	203/ 948	4.54	4.36	3.95	4.00	4.50	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.82	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 312	****	3.95	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

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	3	3	6	9	4.00	1183/1649	3.97	4.44	4.28	4.27	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	533/1648	4.32	4.38	4.23	4.18	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	581/1375	4.44	4.54	4.27	4.22	4.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	474/1595	4.45	4.42	4.20	4.21	4.52	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	3	2	11	4.00	815/1533	3.88	4.21	4.04	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	5	11	4.35	574/1512	4.27	4.35	4.10	4.11	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	261/1623	4.45	4.34	4.16	4.08	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	680/1646	4.92	4.76	4.69	4.67	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	1	7	6	4.20	754/1621	4.02	4.18	4.06	4.02	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	791/1568	4.51	4.52	4.43	4.39	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	894/1572	4.74	4.85	4.70	4.64	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	600/1564	4.57	4.48	4.28	4.25	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	901/1559	4.34	4.37	4.29	4.23	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	1	2	5	9	4.11	624/1352	4.16	4.09	3.98	3.97	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	343/1384	4.66	4.51	4.08	4.11	4.65	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	383/1382	4.88	4.73	4.29	4.37	4.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	285/1368	4.94	4.73	4.30	4.39	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	3	1	13	4.59	176/ 948	4.54	4.36	3.95	4.00	4.59	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	5.00	4.12	3.89	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.61	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.63	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	4.47	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.53	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 288	****	3.82	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.64	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.22	4.09	4.21	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	3.95	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	18
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	2
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	8	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
			Required for Majors	1	Graduate
			General	1	Under-grad
			Electives	1	Non-major
			Other	18	

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 313 0101
 Title PEER ASSISTED LRNING I
 Instructor: BICHY, CASSIE J
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 580
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	1	3.50	1498/1649	3.50	4.44	4.28	4.27	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.38	4.23	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1208/1375	3.50	4.54	4.27	4.22	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.42	4.20	4.21	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	1518/1533	2.40	4.21	4.04	4.05	2.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	1470/1512	2.83	4.35	4.10	4.11	2.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	720/1623	4.33	4.34	4.16	4.08	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1504/1621	3.00	4.18	4.06	4.02	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	731/1568	4.60	4.52	4.43	4.39	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1146/1572	4.60	4.85	4.70	4.64	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	780/1564	4.40	4.48	4.28	4.25	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	832/1559	4.40	4.37	4.29	4.23	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1101/1352	3.40	4.09	3.98	3.97	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1384	****	4.51	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	****	4.73	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1368	****	4.73	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.36	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.22	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.95	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		6
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	4

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 314 0101
 Title PEER ASSISTED LRNING I
 Instructor: BICHY, CASSIE J
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 581
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	2	1	3.80	1351/1649	3.80	4.44	4.28	4.27	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1313/1648	3.80	4.38	4.23	4.18	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.54	4.27	4.22	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	818/1595	4.25	4.42	4.20	4.21	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	1385/1533	3.20	4.21	4.04	4.05	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1202/1512	3.60	4.35	4.10	4.11	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.34	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1429/1621	3.33	4.18	4.06	4.02	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	636/1568	4.67	4.52	4.43	4.39	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1071/1572	4.67	4.85	4.70	4.64	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	854/1564	4.33	4.48	4.28	4.25	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	901/1559	4.33	4.37	4.29	4.23	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1130/1352	3.33	4.09	3.98	3.97	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1384	4.50	4.51	4.08	4.11	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.36	3.95	4.00	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	3.82	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.95	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	5	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 387 0101
 Title TUTORING AND LITERACY
 Instructor: TAYLOR, JOBY B
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 582
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.44	4.28	4.27	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.38	4.23	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.54	4.27	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.42	4.20	4.21	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.21	4.04	4.05	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.35	4.10	4.11	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.34	4.16	4.08	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	483/1621	4.43	4.18	4.06	4.02	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	216/1564	4.86	4.48	4.28	4.25	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.37	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	247/1352	4.60	4.09	3.98	3.97	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.51	4.08	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	342/ 948	4.25	4.36	3.95	4.00	4.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.64	4.06	3.59	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.22	4.09	4.21	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.60	4.47	4.43	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.36	4.38	4.32	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 312	5.00	3.95	3.68	3.60	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 388 0101
 Title INCLUSION & INSTRUCTIO
 Instructor: WILSONCRAIG, GI
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 583
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	2	4	3	4	3.06	1598/1649	3.06	4.44	4.28	4.27	3.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	3	1	8	3.69	1395/1648	3.69	4.38	4.23	4.18	3.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1375	****	4.54	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	3	1	2	8	3.69	1323/1595	3.69	4.42	4.20	4.21	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	0	3	4	6	3.47	1269/1533	3.47	4.21	4.04	4.05	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	4	2	7	3.53	1253/1512	3.53	4.35	4.10	4.11	3.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	6	2	6	3.53	1379/1623	3.53	4.34	4.16	4.08	3.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	799/1646	4.82	4.76	4.69	4.67	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	4	2	6	1	3	2.81	1553/1621	2.81	4.18	4.06	4.02	2.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	3	0	4	3	5	3.47	1468/1568	3.47	4.52	4.43	4.39	3.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	5	9	4.40	1321/1572	4.40	4.85	4.70	4.64	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	0	4	3	5	3.47	1403/1564	3.47	4.48	4.28	4.25	3.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	1	3	2	5	3.20	1448/1559	3.20	4.37	4.29	4.23	3.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	4	0	3	3	4	3.21	1173/1352	3.21	4.09	3.98	3.97	3.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	1081/1384	3.50	4.51	4.08	4.11	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	1146/1382	3.67	4.73	4.29	4.37	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	1181/1368	3.50	4.73	4.30	4.39	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	821/ 948	3.17	4.36	3.95	4.00	3.17	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 288	****	3.82	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	1	0	5	0	3.67	207/ 312	3.67	3.95	3.68	3.60	3.67	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****	

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	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 411 0101
 Title: READ CONTNT AREA II
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, NICOL
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 584
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	4	3	2	2	4	2.93	1614/1649	2.93	4.44	4.28	4.50	2.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	3	2	2	3	2.67	1625/1648	2.67	4.38	4.23	4.36	2.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1208/1375	3.50	4.54	4.27	4.48	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	5	2	2	4	3.07	1531/1595	3.07	4.42	4.20	4.36	3.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	4	3	2	3	3.00	1441/1533	3.00	4.21	4.04	4.14	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	3	2	3	3	3.00	1428/1512	3.00	4.35	4.10	4.26	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	2	3	2	2	3	3.08	1525/1623	3.08	4.34	4.16	4.27	3.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	5	7	3	3.87	1609/1646	3.87	4.76	4.69	4.71	3.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	4	2	5	2	0	2.38	1598/1621	2.38	4.18	4.06	4.24	2.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	3	2	5	1	2.86	1541/1568	2.86	4.52	4.43	4.54	2.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	2	3	3	4	3.36	1546/1572	3.36	4.85	4.70	4.79	3.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	3	3	4	1	2.79	1528/1564	2.79	4.48	4.28	4.40	2.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	1	2	4	2	2.92	1498/1559	2.92	4.37	4.29	4.41	2.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	3	2	1	4	3	3.15	1192/1352	3.15	4.09	3.98	4.07	3.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	1	1	3	2	3.00	1254/1384	3.00	4.51	4.08	4.35	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	1175/1382	3.60	4.73	4.29	4.56	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	4	1	4	3.80	1071/1368	3.80	4.73	4.30	4.58	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	3	0	1	1	2	2.86	885/ 948	2.86	4.36	3.95	4.31	2.86	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	5.00	4.12	4.61	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.61	4.54	4.66	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.63	4.47	4.54	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.47	4.43	4.57	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.53	4.35	4.44	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	66/ 288	4.25	3.82	3.68	3.71	4.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.64	4.06	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.22	4.09	4.42	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	1	0	3	0	3	0	3.00	256/ 312	3.00	3.95	3.68	3.95	3.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.64	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D 0	Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Non-major 15
Electives 0					
#### - Means there are not enough					

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	14	
?	1			

Course-Section: EDUC 412 0101
 Title ANALYSIS OF TCHNG & LR
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 585
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	2	8	4.07	1136/1649	4.07	4.44	4.28	4.50	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	300/1648	4.71	4.38	4.23	4.36	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	347/1375	4.71	4.54	4.27	4.48	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	227/1595	4.77	4.42	4.20	4.36	4.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	410/1533	4.46	4.21	4.04	4.14	4.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	436/1512	4.46	4.35	4.10	4.26	4.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.34	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	531/1646	4.93	4.76	4.69	4.71	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	847/1621	4.11	4.18	4.06	4.24	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	588/1568	4.69	4.52	4.43	4.54	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	216/1564	4.86	4.48	4.28	4.40	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	804/1559	4.43	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	495/1352	4.29	4.09	3.98	4.07	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	613/1384	4.33	4.51	4.08	4.35	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	373/1382	4.78	4.73	4.29	4.56	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	403/1368	4.78	4.73	4.30	4.58	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	4.36	3.95	4.31	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.73	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	5.00	4.12	4.61	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.63	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.61	4.54	4.66	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.63	4.47	4.54	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.47	4.43	4.57	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.53	4.35	4.44	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.82	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.64	4.06	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.22	4.09	4.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.60	4.47	4.52	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.36	4.38	4.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	3.95	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.64	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.84	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.85	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.22	****	

Course-Section: EDUC 412 0101
 Title ANALYSIS OF TCHNG & LR
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 585
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 416 0101
 Title MATERIALS TCH READ
 Instructor: YOUNG, PATRICIA
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 586
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	7	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.44	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	182/1648	4.86	4.38	4.23	4.36	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.54	4.27	4.48	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	272/1595	4.71	4.42	4.20	4.36	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	241/1533	4.67	4.21	4.04	4.14	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	595/1512	4.33	4.35	4.10	4.26	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	427/1623	4.57	4.34	4.16	4.27	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	977/1646	4.71	4.76	4.69	4.71	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1192/1621	3.75	4.18	4.06	4.24	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.54	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	216/1564	4.86	4.48	4.28	4.40	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	448/1559	4.71	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	177/1352	4.71	4.09	3.98	4.07	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	175/1384	4.86	4.51	4.08	4.35	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.58	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	281/ 948	4.40	4.36	3.95	4.31	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	7
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
					0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 417 0101
 Title PROC & ACQUIS READ
 Instructor: YOUNG, PATRICIA
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 587
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	433/1649	4.67	4.44	4.28	4.50	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	756/1648	4.36	4.38	4.23	4.36	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.54	4.27	4.48	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.42	4.20	4.36	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	95/1533	4.92	4.21	4.04	4.14	4.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	324/1512	4.58	4.35	4.10	4.26	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	1	7	4.17	915/1623	4.17	4.34	4.16	4.27	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	913/1646	4.75	4.76	4.69	4.71	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1060/1621	3.90	4.18	4.06	4.24	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	1239/1568	4.09	4.52	4.43	4.54	4.09
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	815/1572	4.82	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	1219/1564	3.91	4.48	4.28	4.40	3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	1	2	5	3.64	1333/1559	3.64	4.37	4.29	4.41	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	501/1352	4.27	4.09	3.98	4.07	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	228/1384	4.78	4.51	4.08	4.35	4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	483/1382	4.67	4.73	4.29	4.56	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	285/1368	4.89	4.73	4.30	4.58	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	330/ 948	4.29	4.36	3.95	4.31	4.29
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.73	****

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 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	2	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	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 418 0101
 Title INSTRUCTION OF READING
 Instructor: SHELTON, NANCY
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 588
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.44	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.38	4.23	4.36	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.54	4.27	4.48	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.42	4.20	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.21	4.04	4.14	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.35	4.10	4.26	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.34	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.18	4.06	4.24	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.54	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.48	4.28	4.40	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.37	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.09	3.98	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.51	4.08	4.35	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.58	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.36	3.95	4.31	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.64	4.29	4.41	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.64	4.06	4.86	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.22	4.09	4.42	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.60	4.47	4.52	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.36	4.38	4.59	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 312	5.00	3.95	3.68	3.95	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 419 0101
 Title ASSESS READING
 Instructor: SHELTON, NANCY
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 589
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.44	4.28	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	999/1648	4.17	4.38	4.23	4.36	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.54	4.27	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	722/1595	4.33	4.42	4.20	4.36	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.21	4.04	4.14	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	263/1512	4.67	4.35	4.10	4.26	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	915/1623	4.17	4.34	4.16	4.27	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1037/1646	4.67	4.76	4.69	4.71	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.18	4.06	4.24	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.54	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	550/1564	4.60	4.48	4.28	4.40	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	586/1559	4.60	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.09	3.98	4.07	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.51	4.08	4.35	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.56	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.58	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.36	3.95	4.31	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 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 7 Non-major 7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 4	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 6	
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 420 0101
 Title TEACH MATH IN ELEM SCH
 Instructor: ALBRIGHT, DEBOR
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 590
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	372/1649	4.71	4.44	4.28	4.50	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	182/1648	4.86	4.38	4.23	4.36	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.54	4.27	4.48	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	162/1595	4.86	4.42	4.20	4.36	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	128/1533	4.86	4.21	4.04	4.14	4.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	225/1512	4.71	4.35	4.10	4.26	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	427/1623	4.57	4.34	4.16	4.27	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	977/1646	4.71	4.76	4.69	4.71	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	191/1621	4.71	4.18	4.06	4.24	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.54	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	263/1564	4.80	4.48	4.28	4.40	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	586/1559	4.60	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	399/1352	4.40	4.09	3.98	4.07	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.51	4.08	4.35	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.58	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.36	3.95	4.31	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	7
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
					Other
					7

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 421 0101
 Title TCHNG SCIENCE: ELEM SC
 Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 591
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.44	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	263/1648	4.75	4.38	4.23	4.36	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.54	4.27	4.48	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	236/1595	4.75	4.42	4.20	4.36	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	718/1533	4.14	4.21	4.04	4.14	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	194/1512	4.75	4.35	4.10	4.26	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.34	4.16	4.27	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	714/1646	4.88	4.76	4.69	4.71	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	105/1621	4.88	4.18	4.06	4.24	4.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	359/1384	4.63	4.51	4.08	4.35	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	272/1382	4.88	4.73	4.29	4.56	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.58	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	4.36	3.95	4.31	4.50	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	388/ 555	4.00	4.64	4.29	4.41	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.95	3.68	3.95	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 422 0101
 Title SOCIAL STUDIES: ELEM S
 Instructor: FITZHUGH, WILLI
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 592
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	6	4.86	230/1649	4.86	4.44	4.28	4.50	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.38	4.23	4.36	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.54	4.27	4.48	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.42	4.20	4.36	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	204/1533	4.71	4.21	4.04	4.14	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	133/1512	4.86	4.35	4.10	4.26	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.34	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1130/1646	4.57	4.76	4.69	4.71	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	113/1621	4.86	4.18	4.06	4.24	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	387/1568	4.80	4.52	4.43	4.54	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1146/1572	4.60	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	263/1564	4.80	4.48	4.28	4.40	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	318/1559	4.80	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.09	3.98	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.51	4.08	4.35	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	483/1382	4.67	4.73	4.29	4.56	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	948/1368	4.00	4.73	4.30	4.58	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.36	3.95	4.31	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.41	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.95	3.68	3.95	4.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.22	****	

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate
56-83	1	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	0
			P 0		### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 1		

Course-Section: EDUC 424 0101
 Title ISSUES IN EC CURRICULU
 Instructor: SMALL, SUE ELLE
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 593
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	0	2	3	4.60	510/1649	4.60	4.44	4.28	4.50	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1313/1648	3.80	4.38	4.23	4.36	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	818/1595	4.25	4.42	4.20	4.36	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1180/1533	3.60	4.21	4.04	4.14	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.35	4.10	4.26	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	635/1623	4.40	4.34	4.16	4.27	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	754/1621	4.20	4.18	4.06	4.24	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	387/1568	4.80	4.52	4.43	4.54	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	1001/1564	4.20	4.48	4.28	4.40	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1246/1559	3.80	4.37	4.29	4.41	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1049/1352	3.50	4.09	3.98	4.07	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	247/1384	4.75	4.51	4.08	4.35	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	394/1382	4.75	4.73	4.29	4.56	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.58	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	699/ 948	3.50	4.36	3.95	4.31	3.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	45/ 88	4.67	4.61	4.54	4.66	4.67	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	46/ 85	4.50	4.63	4.47	4.54	4.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	63/ 81	4.00	4.47	4.43	4.57	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	42/ 92	4.50	4.53	4.35	4.44	4.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.82	3.68	3.71	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	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	7	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	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	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 425 0101
 Title TCHNG ENGLISH:SEC SCHO
 Instructor: NORTH-COLEMAN,
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 594
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.44	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.38	4.23	4.36	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.54	4.27	4.48	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.42	4.20	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.21	4.04	4.14	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.35	4.10	4.26	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.34	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.76	4.69	4.71	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.18	4.06	4.24	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.54	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.48	4.28	4.40	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.37	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.09	3.98	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.51	4.08	4.35	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.58	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.36	3.95	4.31	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 1		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 2
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 426 0101
 Title MATH IN SECONDARY SCHO
 Instructor: ALBRIGHT, DEBOR
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 595
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	3	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.44	4.28	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.38	4.23	4.36	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.54	4.27	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.42	4.20	4.36	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.21	4.04	4.14	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.35	4.10	4.26	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.34	4.16	4.27	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.18	4.06	4.24	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.54	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.48	4.28	4.40	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.37	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.09	3.98	4.07	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.51	4.08	4.35	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.56	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.58	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.36	3.95	4.31	5.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.82	3.68	3.71	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	3	Non-major	3
84-150	2	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	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 427 0101
 Title SCIENCE:SECONDARY SCHO
 Instructor: SINGER, JONATHA
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 596
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	433/1649	4.67	4.44	4.28	4.50	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	362/1648	4.67	4.38	4.23	4.36	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.42	4.20	4.36	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	545/1533	4.33	4.21	4.04	4.14	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.35	4.10	4.26	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.34	4.16	4.27	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.18	4.06	4.24	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1050/1568	4.33	4.52	4.43	4.54	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1071/1572	4.67	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	473/1564	4.67	4.48	4.28	4.40	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	901/1559	4.33	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	208/1352	4.67	4.09	3.98	4.07	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1384	4.50	4.51	4.08	4.35	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.58	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.36	3.95	4.31	4.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	388/ 555	4.00	4.64	4.29	4.41	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.64	4.06	4.86	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	41/ 48	3.00	4.22	4.09	4.42	3.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	39/ 39	3.00	4.60	4.47	4.52	3.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	27/ 39	4.00	4.36	4.38	4.59	4.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.95	3.68	3.95	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 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 3	Non-major 2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 3		
				? 0			

Course-Section: EDUC 428 0101
 Title SOCIAL STUDIES: SEC SC
 Instructor: JAKOVICS, KIMBE
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 597
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	7	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.44	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	182/1648	4.86	4.38	4.23	4.36	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.54	4.27	4.48	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	162/1595	4.86	4.42	4.20	4.36	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	718/1533	4.14	4.21	4.04	4.14	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	331/1512	4.57	4.35	4.10	4.26	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	261/1623	4.71	4.34	4.16	4.27	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	483/1621	4.43	4.18	4.06	4.24	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	554/1568	4.71	4.52	4.43	4.54	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	406/1564	4.71	4.48	4.28	4.40	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	261/1559	4.86	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	495/1352	4.29	4.09	3.98	4.07	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.51	4.08	4.35	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.58	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.36	3.95	4.31	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	338/ 555	4.33	4.64	4.29	4.41	4.33	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	208/ 288	3.33	3.82	3.68	3.71	3.33	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.95	3.68	3.95	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 429 0101
 Title TEACH FORGN LANG SEC S
 Instructor: OSKOZ, ANA
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 598
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.44	4.28	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.38	4.23	4.36	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.54	4.27	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.42	4.20	4.36	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.21	4.04	4.14	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.35	4.10	4.26	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.34	4.16	4.27	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.18	4.06	4.24	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.54	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.48	4.28	4.40	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.37	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.09	3.98	4.07	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.51	4.08	4.35	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.56	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.58	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.36	3.95	4.31	5.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.95	3.68	3.95	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
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	0
			P 0		### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 442 0101
 Title PROCESS SEM ECE - MEDI
 Instructor: COSTELLO, MARGA
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 599
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	5	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.44	4.28	4.50	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	2	4	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.38	4.23	4.36	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	****	4.54	4.27	4.48	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	162/1595	4.86	4.42	4.20	4.36	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	137/1533	4.83	4.21	4.04	4.14	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.35	4.10	4.26	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	0	6	4.13	957/1623	4.13	4.34	4.16	4.27	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.18	4.06	4.24	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1385/1568	3.80	4.52	4.43	4.54	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1273/1564	3.80	4.48	4.28	4.40	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1344/1559	3.60	4.37	4.29	4.41	3.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	970/1352	3.67	4.09	3.98	4.07	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.51	4.08	4.35	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.73	4.29	4.56	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.58	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	4.36	3.95	4.31	4.50	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.82	3.68	3.71	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	217/ 312	3.50	3.95	3.68	3.95	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
56-83	1	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		8
			P 0		Non-major
			I 0		8
			? 0		
				Electives	1
				Other	7

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 443 0101
 Title PROCESS SEM: ECE-M/S I
 Instructor: RIVKIN, MARY
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 600
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	1311/1649	3.86	4.44	4.28	4.50	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	1517/1648	3.43	4.38	4.23	4.36	3.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1335/1595	3.67	4.42	4.20	4.36	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	986/1533	3.83	4.21	4.04	4.14	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	651/1512	4.29	4.35	4.10	4.26	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	0	2	1	0	2.17	1612/1623	2.17	4.34	4.16	4.27	2.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1130/1646	4.57	4.76	4.69	4.71	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1123/1621	3.83	4.18	4.06	4.24	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	1414/1568	3.71	4.52	4.43	4.54	3.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	908/1564	4.29	4.48	4.28	4.40	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1221/1559	3.86	4.37	4.29	4.41	3.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.09	3.98	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	1254/1384	3.00	4.51	4.08	4.35	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	869/1382	4.20	4.73	4.29	4.56	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1071/1368	3.80	4.73	4.30	4.58	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.36	3.95	4.31	4.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.82	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.95	3.68	3.95	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 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 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	5
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 444 0101
 Title TCHNG PROB SOLVNG:ECE
 Instructor: BELL, DEBORAH A
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 601
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	372/1649	4.71	4.44	4.28	4.50	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	300/1648	4.71	4.38	4.23	4.36	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1375	****	4.54	4.27	4.48	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.42	4.20	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	986/1533	3.83	4.21	4.04	4.14	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	225/1512	4.71	4.35	4.10	4.26	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	261/1623	4.71	4.34	4.16	4.27	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	313/1621	4.57	4.18	4.06	4.24	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	554/1568	4.71	4.52	4.43	4.54	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	216/1564	4.86	4.48	4.28	4.40	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	448/1559	4.71	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1352	4.50	4.09	3.98	4.07	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.51	4.08	4.35	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.58	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.36	3.95	4.31	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.82	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.95	3.68	3.95	4.00	

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate
56-83	1	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	0
			P 0		### - Means there are not enough
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 446 0101
 Title LANG, LIT, & INT. DEV
 Instructor: SCULLY, PAT
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 602
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1/1649	5.00	4.44	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.38	4.23	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.42	4.20	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.21	4.04	4.14	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.35	4.10	4.26	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.34	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.76	4.69	4.71	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	234/1621	4.67	4.18	4.06	4.24	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.54	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.48	4.28	4.40	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.37	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	457/1352	4.33	4.09	3.98	4.07	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.51	4.08	4.35	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.58	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.36	3.95	4.31	5.00	

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 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 4
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 451 0101
 Title INTERNSHIP SEM:ECE
 Instructor: SMALL, SUE ELLE
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 603
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	3	4.60	510/1649	4.60	4.44	4.28	4.50	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	966/1648	4.20	4.38	4.23	4.36	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	192/1595	4.80	4.42	4.20	4.36	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1338/1533	3.33	4.21	4.04	4.14	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	522/1512	4.40	4.35	4.10	4.26	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	220/1623	4.75	4.34	4.16	4.27	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.18	4.06	4.24	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	636/1568	4.67	4.52	4.43	4.54	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	473/1564	4.67	4.48	4.28	4.40	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1322/1559	3.67	4.37	4.29	4.41	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.09	3.98	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	326/1384	4.67	4.51	4.08	4.35	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	483/1382	4.67	4.73	4.29	4.56	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.58	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	645/ 948	3.67	4.36	3.95	4.31	3.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	55/ 88	4.50	4.61	4.54	4.66	4.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.63	4.47	4.54	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	4.47	4.43	4.57	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	42/ 92	4.50	4.53	4.35	4.44	4.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.82	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.64	4.06	4.86	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.22	4.09	4.42	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.60	4.47	4.52	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	27/ 39	4.00	4.36	4.38	4.59	4.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.95	3.68	3.95	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	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	5	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	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	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 453 0101
 Title ELEM INTRNSHP SEMINAR
 Instructor: BOURNE, BARBARA
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 604
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	1	1	3.75	1376/1649	3.75	4.44	4.28	4.50	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1347/1648	3.75	4.38	4.23	4.36	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.54	4.27	4.48	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	236/1595	4.75	4.42	4.20	4.36	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	1366/1533	3.25	4.21	4.04	4.14	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	1375/1512	3.25	4.35	4.10	4.26	3.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1533/1623	3.00	4.34	4.16	4.27	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1398/1646	4.25	4.76	4.69	4.71	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1345/1621	3.50	4.18	4.06	4.24	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.51	4.08	4.35	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.73	4.29	4.56	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	426/1368	4.75	4.73	4.30	4.58	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.36	3.95	4.31	4.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.64	4.29	4.41	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	65/ 88	4.25	4.61	4.54	4.66	4.25	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	78/ 85	3.75	4.63	4.47	4.54	3.75	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	73/ 81	3.75	4.47	4.43	4.57	3.75	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	78/ 92	3.75	4.53	4.35	4.44	3.75	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	173/ 288	3.75	3.82	3.68	3.71	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 471 0101
 Title PRIN OF TRAINING AND D
 Instructor: MCSHANE, RYAN
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 605
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	0	2	7	4.40	776/1649	4.40	4.44	4.28	4.50	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	0	6	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.38	4.23	4.36	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	296/1375	4.75	4.54	4.27	4.48	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	890/1595	4.20	4.42	4.20	4.36	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	1017/1533	3.80	4.21	4.04	4.14	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	627/1512	4.30	4.35	4.10	4.26	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	0	4	3.50	1387/1623	3.50	4.34	4.16	4.27	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	1004/1646	4.70	4.76	4.69	4.71	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1225/1621	3.71	4.18	4.06	4.24	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	1050/1568	4.33	4.52	4.43	4.54	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	640/1572	4.89	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	854/1564	4.33	4.48	4.28	4.40	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	777/1559	4.44	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	303/1352	4.50	4.09	3.98	4.07	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	737/1384	4.14	4.51	4.08	4.35	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	696/1382	4.43	4.73	4.29	4.56	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	827/1368	4.29	4.73	4.30	4.58	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	4.36	3.95	4.31	4.50	

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 0		0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	9

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 601 0101
 Title HUMAN LEARNING/COGNITI
 Instructor: OLIVA, LINDA M.
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 606
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	4	1	4	4	9	3.59	1473/1649	3.59	4.44	4.28	4.46	3.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	1	7	7	4	3.48	1494/1648	3.48	4.38	4.23	4.34	3.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	1	4	1	3	3.67	1150/1375	3.67	4.54	4.27	4.44	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	5	8	4	3.41	1445/1595	3.41	4.42	4.20	4.35	3.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	5	6	5	3.32	1344/1533	3.32	4.21	4.04	4.28	3.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	8	3	7	3.55	1240/1512	3.55	4.35	4.10	4.35	3.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	5	3	4	7	3.32	1470/1623	3.32	4.34	4.16	4.29	3.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	4	1	2	14	4.09	1509/1646	4.09	4.76	4.69	4.81	4.09	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	1	7	6	2	3.28	1446/1621	3.28	4.18	4.06	4.20	3.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	4	7	7	3.81	1385/1568	3.81	4.52	4.43	4.52	3.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	6	14	4.57	1174/1572	4.57	4.85	4.70	4.83	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	3	4	7	5	3.48	1399/1564	3.48	4.48	4.28	4.41	3.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	2	4	9	2	3.14	1460/1559	3.14	4.37	4.29	4.41	3.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	4	3	2	4	5	3.17	1189/1352	3.17	4.09	3.98	4.10	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	4	5	7	5	3.62	1034/1384	3.62	4.51	4.08	4.30	3.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	774/1382	4.33	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	3	7	10	4.19	876/1368	4.19	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.19	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	3	1	3	8	3	3.39	754/ 948	3.39	4.36	3.95	4.03	3.39	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.27	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	5.00	4.12	4.61	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.73	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.80	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 88	****	4.61	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	4.63	4.47	4.50	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 81	****	4.47	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.53	4.35	4.42	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	1	0	0	6	0	3.57	185/ 288	3.57	3.82	3.68	3.87	3.57	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	41/ 52	3.33	4.64	4.06	4.51	3.33	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	2	0	0	4	0	3.00	41/ 48	3.00	4.22	4.09	4.47	3.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	1	1	0	3	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.60	4.47	4.58	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	2	1	3	0	3.17	38/ 39	3.17	4.36	4.38	4.44	3.17	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	2	3	0	7	0	3.00	256/ 312	3.00	3.95	3.68	3.83	3.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.37	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.49	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.92	****	

Course-Section: EDUC 601 0101
 Title HUMAN LEARNING/COGNITI
 Instructor: OLIVA, LINDA M.
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 606
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	3	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	11	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Course-Section: EDUC 602T 8010
 Title
 Instructor: HODELL, CHARLES
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 607
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	186/1649	4.91	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	148/1648	4.91	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	401/1375	4.67	4.54	4.27	4.44	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	352/1595	4.64	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.21	4.04	4.28	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	217/1512	4.73	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	251/1623	4.73	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	101/1621	4.89	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	169/1564	4.91	4.48	4.28	4.41	4.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	205/1559	4.91	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	501/1352	4.27	4.09	3.98	4.10	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	150/1384	4.90	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	243/1382	4.90	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	104/ 948	4.80	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.80	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.60	4.47	4.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	3	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	11
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.	6	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 605 8010
 Title THE ADULT LEARNER
 Instructor: RAUDENBUSH, LIN
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 608
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	7	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.44	4.28	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	475/1648	4.57	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	806/1375	4.25	4.54	4.27	4.44	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	417/1595	4.57	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	311/1533	4.57	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	493/1512	4.43	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	936/1623	4.14	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	715/1572	4.86	4.85	4.70	4.83	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	406/1564	4.71	4.48	4.28	4.41	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	1045/1559	4.14	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.09	3.98	4.10	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	394/1384	4.57	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	292/1382	4.86	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	316/1368	4.86	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	265/ 948	4.43	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.43	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 607 0101
 Title PROCESSES & ACQ READIN
 Instructor: YOUNG, PATRICIA
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 609
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	4.00	1183/1649	4.00	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1591/1648	3.00	4.38	4.23	4.34	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1259/1375	3.33	4.54	4.27	4.44	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	1570/1595	2.75	4.42	4.20	4.35	2.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	624/1533	4.25	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1428/1512	3.00	4.35	4.10	4.35	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	913/1646	4.75	4.76	4.69	4.81	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1504/1621	3.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	1547/1568	2.75	4.52	4.43	4.52	2.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1463/1572	4.00	4.85	4.70	4.83	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	1552/1564	2.33	4.48	4.28	4.41	2.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	1556/1559	1.33	4.37	4.29	4.41	1.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1335/1352	2.00	4.09	3.98	4.10	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1081/1384	3.50	4.51	4.08	4.30	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	844/1368	4.25	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	901/ 948	2.67	4.36	3.95	4.03	2.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	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	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 2
Grad.	2	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 608 0101
 Title INSTRUCT READING
 Instructor: SHELTON, NANCY
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 610
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.44	4.28	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.54	4.27	4.44	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	818/1595	4.25	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	180/1533	4.75	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	380/1512	4.50	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1533/1623	3.00	4.34	4.16	4.29	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	913/1646	4.75	4.76	4.69	4.81	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.48	4.28	4.41	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	695/1559	4.50	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	457/1352	4.33	4.09	3.98	4.10	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.51	4.08	4.30	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	122/ 948	4.75	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.75	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.64	4.06	4.51	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.22	4.09	4.47	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.60	4.47	4.58	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.36	4.38	4.44	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 312	5.00	3.95	3.68	3.83	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	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	3	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 615 0101
 Title MATERIALS TEACH READ
 Instructor: YOUNG, PATRICIA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 611
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.54	4.27	4.44	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	380/1512	4.50	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.34	4.16	4.29	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.76	4.69	4.81	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	374/1621	4.25	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.48	4.28	4.41	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	695/1559	4.50	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1049/1352	3.50	4.09	3.98	4.10	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1384	4.50	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.00

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 1		Graduate 2
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 0
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 615 0101
 Title MATERIALS TEACH READ
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 612
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.54	4.27	4.44	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	380/1512	4.50	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.34	4.16	4.29	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.76	4.69	4.81	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	914/1621	4.25	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.25

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1384	4.50	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.36	3.95	4.03	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 2	Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 0	Non-major 0
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 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: EDUC 621 0101
 Title INST STRAT/INTEG ECE C
 Instructor: BELL, DEBORAH A
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 613
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	7	4.88	212/1649	4.88	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	263/1648	4.75	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	401/1375	4.67	4.54	4.27	4.44	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	608/1595	4.43	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	1103/1533	3.71	4.21	4.04	4.28	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	225/1512	4.71	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	370/1623	4.63	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	313/1621	4.57	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	480/1568	4.75	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	524/1564	4.63	4.48	4.28	4.41	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	695/1559	4.50	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1277/1352	2.75	4.09	3.98	4.10	2.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.51	4.08	4.30	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	316/1368	4.86	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	179/ 948	4.57	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.57	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.82	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.95	3.68	3.83	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	4	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 622 0101
 Title INSTRUC STRGY ELEM MAT
 Instructor: ALBRIGHT, DEBOR
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 614
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.44	4.28	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	441/1648	4.60	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.42	4.20	4.35	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	151/1533	4.80	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	522/1512	4.40	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	395/1623	4.60	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1103/1646	4.60	4.76	4.69	4.81	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.48	4.28	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.37	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	303/1352	4.50	4.09	3.98	4.10	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	247/1384	4.75	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.36	3.95	4.03	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	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 1
Grad.	5	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 623 0101
 Title INSTRUC STRTGY TEACH S
 Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 615
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	5	4.83	247/1649	4.83	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	195/1648	4.83	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.54	4.27	4.44	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	263/1512	4.67	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	321/1623	4.67	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	782/1646	4.83	4.76	4.69	4.81	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	165/1621	4.75	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	326/1384	4.67	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	312/1382	4.83	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	522/1368	4.67	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.50
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.92	****

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

Course-Section: EDUC 625 0101
 Title TEACH READ WRIT ESL I
 Instructor: SHIN, SARAH
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 616
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	4	5	4.27	943/1649	4.27	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	401/1648	4.64	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	704/1375	4.36	4.54	4.27	4.44	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	263/1595	4.73	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	421/1533	4.45	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	564/1512	4.36	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	251/1623	4.73	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	313/1621	4.57	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	535/1568	4.73	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	815/1572	4.82	4.85	4.70	4.83	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	253/1564	4.82	4.48	4.28	4.41	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	549/1559	4.64	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	482/1352	4.30	4.09	3.98	4.10	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	582/1384	4.36	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	585/1382	4.55	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	461/1368	4.73	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	242/ 948	4.45	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.45	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.66	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	3.95	3.68	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 627 0101
 Title INS STRAT FL SEC SCH
 Instructor: OSKOZ, ANA
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 617
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	3	4.75	328/1649	4.75	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	263/1648	4.75	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.54	4.27	4.44	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	236/1595	4.75	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.21	4.04	4.28	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	194/1512	4.75	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	931/1572	4.75	4.85	4.70	4.83	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.48	4.28	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.37	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.09	3.98	4.10	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.51	4.08	4.30	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.36	3.95	4.03	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	266/ 288	2.00	3.82	3.68	3.87	2.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 3	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 2
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 629 0101
 Title INST STRAT:TCHNG SEC S
 Instructor: SINGER, JONATHA
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 618
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	0	3.50	1498/1649	3.50	4.44	4.28	4.46	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1481/1648	3.50	4.38	4.23	4.34	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1208/1375	3.50	4.54	4.27	4.44	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1397/1595	3.50	4.42	4.20	4.35	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	815/1533	4.00	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1266/1512	3.50	4.35	4.10	4.35	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1345/1621	3.50	4.18	4.06	4.20	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1241/1572	4.50	4.85	4.70	4.83	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.48	4.28	4.41	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	695/1559	4.50	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1352	4.50	4.09	3.98	4.10	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.51	4.08	4.30	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.36	3.95	4.03	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.82	3.68	3.87	4.00	

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	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	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 632 0101
 Title INST STRAT:TCHG SEC EN
 Instructor: NORTH-COLEMAN,
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 619
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1311/1649	3.86	4.44	4.28	4.46	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1375/1648	3.71	4.38	4.23	4.34	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1103/1533	3.71	4.21	4.04	4.28	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	799/1512	4.14	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	2	0	3.14	1512/1623	3.14	4.34	4.16	4.29	3.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1192/1621	3.75	4.18	4.06	4.20	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	4	1	3.67	1426/1568	3.67	4.52	4.43	4.52	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	1071/1572	4.67	4.85	4.70	4.83	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	0	2	2	3.67	1336/1564	3.67	4.48	4.28	4.41	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1246/1559	3.80	4.37	4.29	4.41	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	457/1352	4.33	4.09	3.98	4.10	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	673/1384	4.25	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.52	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	601/ 948	3.75	4.36	3.95	4.03	3.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 636 0101
 Title ESL/FOR LANG TEST & EV
 Instructor: NELSON, JOHN E.
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 620
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	16	4.94	112/1649	4.94	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	202/1648	4.82	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	226/1375	4.81	4.54	4.27	4.44	4.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	144/1595	4.88	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	142/1533	4.82	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	146/1512	4.82	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.34	4.16	4.29	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	101/1621	4.89	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	206/1564	4.87	4.48	4.28	4.41	4.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	143/1559	4.93	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	129/1352	4.82	4.09	3.98	4.10	4.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	343/1384	4.64	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	194/1382	4.93	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	392/1368	4.79	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	137/ 948	4.71	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.71	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.82	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.95	3.68	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	11	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	6	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 642 0101
 Title ECE MATH/SCI PROCESSES
 Instructor: RIVKIN, MARY
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 621
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	1	4	4.14	1076/1649	4.14	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	0	3	3.57	1457/1648	3.57	4.38	4.23	4.34	3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	3	3	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	1103/1533	3.71	4.21	4.04	4.28	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1068/1512	3.83	4.35	4.10	4.35	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	1	2	0	2.43	1603/1623	2.43	4.34	4.16	4.29	2.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	977/1646	4.71	4.76	4.69	4.81	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	1191/1568	4.17	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	765/1572	4.83	4.85	4.70	4.83	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1127/1564	4.00	4.48	4.28	4.41	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1121/1559	4.00	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	399/1352	4.40	4.09	3.98	4.10	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	911/1384	3.86	4.51	4.08	4.30	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	435/1382	4.71	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	732/1368	4.43	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 644 0101
 Title LING/ESOL EDUCATORS
 Instructor: SHIN, SARAH
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 622
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	306/1649	4.78	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	362/1648	4.67	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	505/1375	4.56	4.54	4.27	4.44	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	818/1595	4.25	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	241/1533	4.67	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	225/1512	4.71	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	130/1623	4.89	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	313/1621	4.57	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	480/1568	4.75	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	310/1564	4.78	4.48	4.28	4.41	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	361/1559	4.78	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	5	3	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.09	3.98	4.10	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	228/1384	4.78	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	262/1382	4.89	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	285/1368	4.89	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	399/ 948	4.13	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.13	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.82	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.95	3.68	3.83	4.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 650 0101
 Title EDUC IN CULTURAL PERSP
 Instructor: SMITH JR, MURDU
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 623
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	577/1649	4.56	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	310/1648	4.71	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	12	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	233/1375	4.80	4.54	4.27	4.44	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	254/1595	4.73	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	0	3	12	4.22	653/1533	4.22	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	479/1512	4.44	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	480/1623	4.53	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	1258/1646	4.44	4.76	4.69	4.81	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	165/1621	4.75	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	715/1568	4.62	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	740/1572	4.85	4.85	4.70	4.83	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	225/1564	4.85	4.48	4.28	4.41	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	272/1559	4.85	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	341/1352	4.46	4.09	3.98	4.10	4.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	266/1384	4.73	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	170/1382	4.93	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	185/1368	4.93	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	97/ 948	4.86	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.86	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 288	****	3.82	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	1	0	6	0	3.71	200/ 312	3.71	3.95	3.68	3.83	3.71	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 654 0101
 Title PROC & ACQUIS LANG & L
 Instructor: SCULLY, PAT
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 624
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.44	4.28	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.38	4.23	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	****	4.54	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.42	4.20	4.35	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.21	4.04	4.28	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.35	4.10	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.34	4.16	4.29	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.48	4.28	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.37	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.09	3.98	4.10	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.51	4.08	4.30	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.36	3.95	4.03	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	3	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 659 0101
 Title READ CONTNT AREA II
 Instructor: NORTH-COLEMAN,
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 625
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	4	8	4.13	1086/1649	4.13	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	10	4.33	797/1648	4.33	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1375	****	4.54	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	462/1595	4.54	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	1	8	3.73	1084/1533	3.73	4.21	4.04	4.28	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	0	10	4.07	854/1512	4.07	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	5	8	4.27	803/1623	4.27	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	442/1621	4.45	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	815/1568	4.53	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	690/1572	4.87	4.85	4.70	4.83	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	929/1564	4.27	4.48	4.28	4.41	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	2	11	4.40	832/1559	4.40	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	1	11	4.47	341/1352	4.47	4.09	3.98	4.10	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	644/1384	4.30	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	493/1368	4.70	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	365/ 948	4.20	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.20	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	246/ 288	2.75	3.82	3.68	3.87	2.75	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	3.95	3.68	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	14
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: EDUC 663 0101
 Title ELEM SOC STUD METH
 Instructor: FITZHUGH, WILLI
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 626
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	433/1649	4.67	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.38	4.23	4.34	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.42	4.20	4.35	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.35	4.10	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.34	4.16	4.29	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	234/1621	4.67	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.48	4.28	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	695/1559	4.50	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.09	3.98	4.10	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1384	4.50	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.36	3.95	4.03	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.64	4.29	4.66	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.82	3.68	3.87	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	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 2
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 664 0101
 Title SEC SOC STUD METH
 Instructor: JAKOVICS, KIMBE
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 627
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	3	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.38	4.23	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.54	4.27	4.44	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	236/1595	4.75	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	624/1533	4.25	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.35	4.10	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	220/1623	4.75	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	913/1646	4.75	4.76	4.69	4.81	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.48	4.28	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.37	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.09	3.98	4.10	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.51	4.08	4.30	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.36	3.95	4.03	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	266/ 288	2.00	3.82	3.68	3.87	2.00	

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	1	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 2
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 2
Grad.	2	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 665 0101
 Title CREATIVE MEDIA-ECE
 Instructor: COSTELLO, MARGA
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 628
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	0	2	0	2	4.00	1183/1649	4.00	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	897/1648	4.25	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	****	4.54	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1139/1533	3.67	4.21	4.04	4.28	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	595/1512	4.33	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	220/1623	4.75	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1037/1646	4.67	4.76	4.69	4.81	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	687/1621	4.25	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1050/1568	4.33	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	473/1564	4.67	4.48	4.28	4.41	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	512/1559	4.67	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	970/1352	3.67	4.09	3.98	4.10	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	965/1384	3.75	4.51	4.08	4.30	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	426/1368	4.75	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	310/ 948	4.33	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.33	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.82	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.95	3.68	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	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	4	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 667 0101
 Title GRAMMAR FOR AMER ENGL
 Instructor: NELSON, JOHN E.
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 629
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	230/1649	4.86	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	182/1648	4.86	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	133/1375	4.92	4.54	4.27	4.44	4.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	342/1595	4.64	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	151/1533	4.80	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	240/1512	4.69	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	97/1623	4.92	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	133/1621	4.80	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.48	4.28	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.37	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	970/1352	3.67	4.09	3.98	4.10	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	175/1384	4.86	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	194/1382	4.93	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	392/1368	4.79	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	297/ 948	4.36	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.36	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 288	****	3.82	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	232/ 312	3.40	3.95	3.68	3.83	3.40	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 669 0101
 Title ASSESS READING
 Instructor: SHELTON, NANCY
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 630
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.44	4.28	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	441/1648	4.60	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	****	4.54	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.42	4.20	4.35	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	137/1533	4.83	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.35	4.10	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1340/1646	4.33	4.76	4.69	4.81	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	165/1621	4.75	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.48	4.28	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.37	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	303/1352	4.50	4.09	3.98	4.10	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1384	4.80	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	104/ 948	4.80	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.80	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 678 0101
 Title INST STRAT/DIV NEEDS
 Instructor: BERGE, NANCY B
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 631
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	3	10	4.64	459/1649	4.64	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	388/1648	4.64	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1375	****	4.54	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	417/1595	4.57	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	493/1512	4.43	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	145/1623	4.86	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	531/1646	4.93	4.76	4.69	4.81	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	535/1621	4.38	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	588/1568	4.69	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	434/1564	4.69	4.48	4.28	4.41	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	376/1559	4.77	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	152/1352	4.77	4.09	3.98	4.10	4.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	478/1384	4.46	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	593/1382	4.54	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	493/1368	4.69	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	0	5	3	2	3.45	722/ 948	3.45	4.36	3.95	4.03	3.45	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.82	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.95	3.68	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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 681 8010
 Title SURV OF INSTR TECH APP
 Instructor: KELLERMAN, PAUL
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 632
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.44	4.28	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	362/1648	4.67	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.54	4.27	4.44	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	174/1595	4.83	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.21	4.04	4.28	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	294/1512	4.63	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	130/1623	4.89	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	595/1621	4.33	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	287/1568	4.88	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	473/1564	4.67	4.48	4.28	4.41	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	227/1559	4.89	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.09	3.98	4.10	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	359/1384	4.63	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	426/1368	4.75	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	152/ 948	4.67	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.27	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 243	****	5.00	4.12	4.61	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.73	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.80	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.64	4.29	4.66	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.61	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.63	4.47	4.50	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.47	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.53	4.35	4.42	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.82	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.64	4.06	4.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.60	4.47	4.58	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.36	4.38	4.44	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	3.95	3.68	3.83	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.37	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.92	****	

Course-Section: EDUC 681 8010
 Title SURV OF INSTR TECH APP
 Instructor: KELLERMAN, PAUL
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 632
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	5	Non-major	4
84-150	0	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	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 682 8010
 Title INST TECH DESIGN/DEV
 Instructor: WALSH, GREGORY
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 633
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	723/1649	4.44	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	498/1648	4.56	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1375	****	4.54	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	853/1595	4.22	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	740/1533	4.11	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	651/1512	4.29	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	968/1623	4.11	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	697/1646	4.89	4.76	4.69	4.81	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	547/1621	4.38	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	1145/1568	4.22	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	728/1564	4.44	4.48	4.28	4.41	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	640/1559	4.56	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	208/1352	4.67	4.09	3.98	4.10	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	613/1384	4.33	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	262/1382	4.89	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	403/1368	4.78	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	97/ 948	4.86	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.86	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.27	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	5.00	4.12	4.61	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.73	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.80	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.66	****	
Self Paced															
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	6	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				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
 Fall 2008

Page 634
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	1	10	4.62	497/1649	4.62	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	188/1648	4.85	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	166/1375	4.90	4.54	4.27	4.44	4.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	227/1595	4.77	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	2	9	4.38	495/1533	4.38	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	302/1512	4.62	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	284/1623	4.69	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	101/1621	4.89	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	330/1568	4.85	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	473/1572	4.92	4.85	4.70	4.83	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	0	12	4.69	434/1564	4.69	4.48	4.28	4.41	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	475/1559	4.69	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	2	1	0	3	3.00	1219/1352	3.00	4.09	3.98	4.10	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	326/1384	4.67	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	394/1382	4.75	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	426/1368	4.75	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	0	0	11	4.67	152/ 948	4.67	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.67	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	5.00	4.12	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.80	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.63	4.47	4.50	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.47	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.53	4.35	4.42	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 288	****	3.82	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.64	4.06	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.22	4.09	4.47	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.60	4.47	4.58	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.36	4.38	4.44	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	181/ 312	3.83	3.95	3.68	3.83	3.83	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.37	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.49	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.92	****	

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 634
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 689 8010
 Title ADV SPEC TOP IN EDUC
 Instructor: PETSKA, DEBORAH
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 635
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	6	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.44	4.28	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	195/1648	4.83	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.54	4.27	4.44	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.42	4.20	4.35	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.21	4.04	4.28	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	142/1512	4.83	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.34	4.16	4.29	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	782/1646	4.83	4.76	4.69	4.81	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	165/1621	4.75	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.48	4.28	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.37	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	123/1352	4.83	4.09	3.98	4.10	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.51	4.08	4.30	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.36	3.95	4.03	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	4.61	4.54	4.63	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.63	4.47	4.50	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 81	5.00	4.47	4.43	4.43	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.53	4.35	4.42	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 288	5.00	3.82	3.68	3.87	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	2	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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						
				?	0						
						Other	2				

Course-Section: EDUC 689G 8010
 Title Serious Games
 Instructor: Raudenbush (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 8
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	5	4.83	247/1649	****	4.52	4.28	4.11	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1648	****	4.35	4.23	4.16	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1375	****	4.38	4.27	4.10	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	174/1595	****	4.38	4.20	4.03	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	815/1533	****	4.01	4.04	3.87	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	142/1512	****	4.35	4.10	3.86	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	321/1623	****	4.22	4.16	4.08	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1646	****	4.85	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	165/1621	****	4.07	4.06	3.96	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1568	****	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	****	4.82	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1564	****	4.29	4.28	4.20	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	284/1559	****	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1130/1352	****	3.91	3.98	3.86	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	****	4.39	4.08	3.86	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1382	****	4.49	4.29	4.03	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1368	****	4.43	4.30	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 948	****	4.24	3.95	3.75	5.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.43	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.91	4.40	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 555	****	4.01	4.29	4.14	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.75	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.38	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.67	4.43	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	229/ 288	****	3.36	3.68	3.54	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.81	3.68	3.51	****	

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

Course-Section: EDUC 689G 8010
 Title Serious Games
 Instructor: Sugar, Steve (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 9
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	247/1649	****	4.52	4.28	4.11	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1648	****	4.35	4.23	4.16	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1375	****	4.38	4.27	4.10	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	174/1595	****	4.38	4.20	4.03	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	815/1533	****	4.01	4.04	3.87	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	142/1512	****	4.35	4.10	3.86	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	321/1623	****	4.22	4.16	4.08	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1646	****	4.85	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	374/1621	****	4.07	4.06	3.96	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	344/1568	****	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	****	4.82	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	263/1564	****	4.29	4.28	4.20	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1559	****	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	690/1352	****	3.91	3.98	3.86	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	****	4.39	4.08	3.86	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1382	****	4.49	4.29	4.03	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1368	****	4.43	4.30	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 948	****	4.24	3.95	3.75	5.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.43	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.91	4.40	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 555	****	4.01	4.29	4.14	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.75	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.38	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.67	4.43	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	229/ 288	****	3.36	3.68	3.54	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.81	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 771 8750
 Title RESEARCH DESIGNS IN ED
 Instructor: MURDOCK, JOHN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 636
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	12	6	4.20	1027/1649	4.20	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	9	6	4.05	1094/1648	4.05	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	16	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1375	****	4.54	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	11	4.40	636/1595	4.40	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	4	7	4	3.56	1214/1533	3.56	4.21	4.04	4.28	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	366/1512	4.53	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	358/1623	4.63	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	398/1646	4.94	4.76	4.69	4.81	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	1	11	2	4.07	875/1621	4.07	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	355/1572	4.95	4.85	4.70	4.83	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	8	7	4.05	1105/1564	4.05	4.48	4.28	4.41	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	7	8	4.15	1038/1559	4.15	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	9	8	4.32	473/1352	4.32	4.09	3.98	4.10	4.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	9	8	4.32	633/1384	4.32	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	511/1382	4.63	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	392/1368	4.79	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	338/ 948	4.27	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.27
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.27	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 243	****	5.00	4.12	4.61	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.73	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.80	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.66	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.61	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.63	4.47	4.50	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 81	****	4.47	4.43	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.53	4.35	4.42	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.82	3.68	3.87	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	3.95	3.68	3.83	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.49	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.43	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.67	****

Course-Section: EDUC 771 8750
 Title RESEARCH DESIGNS IN ED
 Instructor: MURDOCK, JOHN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 636
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	8	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 781 8720
 Title TEACHER LEADERSHIP
 Instructor: RUEHL, SCOTT
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 637
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	6	13	4.52	617/1649	4.52	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	253/1648	4.76	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.54	4.27	4.44	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	227/1595	4.76	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	280/1533	4.62	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	331/1512	4.57	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	145/1623	4.86	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	977/1646	4.71	4.76	4.69	4.81	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	288/1621	4.60	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	19	4.81	387/1568	4.81	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	216/1564	4.86	4.48	4.28	4.41	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	318/1559	4.81	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	177/1352	4.71	4.09	3.98	4.10	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	150/1384	4.90	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	243/1382	4.90	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	97/ 948	4.86	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.86	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.66	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	9	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	12	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 782 0101
 Title ISSUES IN ECE
 Instructor: SMALL, SUE
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 638
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	3	2	4.17	1057/1649	4.17	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	362/1648	4.67	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	****	4.54	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	722/1595	4.33	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1249/1533	3.50	4.21	4.04	4.28	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	782/1512	4.17	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	720/1623	4.33	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	511/1621	4.40	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	1050/1568	4.33	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	854/1564	4.33	4.48	4.28	4.41	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1031/1559	4.17	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1002/1352	3.60	4.09	3.98	4.10	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	726/1384	4.17	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	380/ 948	4.17	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.17	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	45/ 88	4.67	4.61	4.54	4.63	4.67	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.63	4.47	4.50	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	35/ 81	4.67	4.47	4.43	4.43	4.67	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	35/ 92	4.60	4.53	4.35	4.42	4.60	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	20/ 288	4.80	3.82	3.68	3.87	4.80	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.64	4.06	4.51	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.22	4.09	4.47	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.60	4.47	4.58	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.36	4.38	4.44	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	28/ 312	4.50	3.95	3.68	3.83	4.50	

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	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	1	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 791P 0101
 Title PRACTICUM IN ED SEC 7-
 Instructor: MURPHY, JOYCE A
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 639
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	803/1649	4.38	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	1082/1648	4.08	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	763/1375	4.31	4.54	4.27	4.44	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	660/1595	4.38	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	545/1533	4.33	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	6	5	4.17	782/1512	4.17	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	1	1	6	3.75	1270/1623	3.75	4.34	4.16	4.29	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.76	4.69	4.81	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	6	0	3.86	1105/1621	3.86	4.18	4.06	4.20	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1568	****	4.52	4.43	4.52	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1572	****	4.85	4.70	4.83	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1564	****	4.48	4.28	4.41	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1559	****	4.37	4.29	4.41	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1352	****	4.09	3.98	4.10	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	732/1384	4.15	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.15	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	302/1382	4.85	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	327/1368	4.85	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	193/ 948	4.54	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.54	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.27	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	5.00	4.12	4.61	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.73	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.80	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	62/ 88	4.31	4.61	4.54	4.63	4.31	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	43/ 85	4.62	4.63	4.47	4.50	4.62	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	46/ 81	4.38	4.47	4.43	4.43	4.38	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	55/ 92	4.38	4.53	4.35	4.42	4.38	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	2	3	0	1	7	3.62	183/ 288	3.62	3.82	3.68	3.87	3.62	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	11	4.62	27/ 52	4.62	4.64	4.06	4.51	4.62	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	1	0	3	1	8	4.15	23/ 48	4.15	4.22	4.09	4.47	4.15	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	6	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	13/ 39	4.86	4.60	4.47	4.58	4.86	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	3	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	24/ 39	4.22	4.36	4.38	4.44	4.22	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	2	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	66/ 312	4.10	3.95	3.68	3.83	4.10	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.37	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.49	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.92	****	

Course-Section: EDUC 791P 0101
 Title PRACTICUM IN ED SEC 7-
 Instructor: MURPHY, JOYCE A
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 639
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	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	6	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 791S 0101
 Title PRAC IN ED TESOL K-12
 Instructor: WILSON, MARGARE
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 640
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	4	4.60	510/1649	4.60	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1375	****	4.54	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	890/1595	4.20	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	680/1533	4.20	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	755/1512	4.20	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1496/1623	3.20	4.34	4.16	4.29	3.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	833/1646	4.80	4.76	4.69	4.81	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1429/1621	3.33	4.18	4.06	4.20	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1385/1568	3.80	4.52	4.43	4.52	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	1419/1572	4.20	4.85	4.70	4.83	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1360/1564	3.60	4.48	4.28	4.41	3.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1408/1559	3.40	4.37	4.29	4.41	3.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	1301/1352	2.50	4.09	3.98	4.10	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1192/1384	3.25	4.51	4.08	4.30	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	1286/1368	3.00	4.73	4.30	4.56	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	699/ 948	3.50	4.36	3.95	4.03	3.50	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.82	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	3.95	3.68	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 792 2303
 Title ISD INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: ZONGKER, SHIRLE
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 641
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	6	4.55	590/1649	3.98	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	629/1648	4.28	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.54	4.27	4.44	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	192/1595	4.27	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1006/1533	3.94	4.21	4.04	4.28	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	451/1512	4.34	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	164/1623	4.64	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	8	1	4.00	914/1621	4.17	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	708/1384	4.32	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	616/1382	4.33	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	493/1368	4.46	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	533/ 948	3.30	4.36	3.95	4.03	3.90	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	64/ 88	4.27	4.61	4.54	4.63	4.27	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	32/ 85	4.73	4.63	4.47	4.50	4.73	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	32/ 81	4.73	4.47	4.43	4.43	4.73	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	48/ 92	4.45	4.53	4.35	4.42	4.45	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	19/ 288	4.82	3.82	3.68	3.87	4.82	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	20/ 52	4.82	4.64	4.06	4.51	4.82	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	18/ 48	4.45	4.22	4.09	4.47	4.45	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	14/ 39	4.82	4.60	4.47	4.58	4.82	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	2	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	18/ 39	4.56	4.36	4.38	4.44	4.56	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	24/ 312	4.64	3.95	3.68	3.83	4.64	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 792 2304
 Title ISD INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: ZONGKER, SHIRLE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 642
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	7	1	3.70	1402/1649	3.98	4.44	4.28	4.46	3.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	966/1648	4.28	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1375	5.00	4.54	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	1067/1595	4.27	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	815/1533	3.94	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	651/1512	4.34	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	448/1623	4.64	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1621	4.17	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1568	4.38	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1572	4.88	4.85	4.70	4.83	4.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	571/1384	4.32	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	831/1382	4.33	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	796/1368	4.46	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	844/ 948	3.30	4.36	3.95	4.03	3.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	4.27	4.61	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	4.73	4.63	4.47	4.50	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	4.73	4.47	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	4.45	4.53	4.35	4.42	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 288	4.82	3.82	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	4.64	3.95	3.68	3.83	****	

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	8	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	Graduate 2
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Under-grad 8
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Non-major 10
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 0
					Other 9

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	7	1	3.70	1402/1649	3.98	4.44	4.28	4.46	3.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	966/1648	4.28	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1375	5.00	4.54	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	1067/1595	4.27	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	815/1533	3.94	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	651/1512	4.34	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	448/1623	4.64	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	595/1621	4.17	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1012/1568	4.38	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	665/1572	4.88	4.85	4.70	4.83	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	812/1564	4.38	4.48	4.28	4.41	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	861/1559	4.38	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1189/1352	3.17	4.09	3.98	4.10	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	571/1384	4.32	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	831/1382	4.33	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	796/1368	4.46	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	844/ 948	3.30	4.36	3.95	4.03	3.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	4.27	4.61	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	4.73	4.63	4.47	4.50	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	4.73	4.47	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	4.45	4.53	4.35	4.42	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 288	4.82	3.82	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	4.64	3.95	3.68	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 792L 0101
 Title INT IN EDU TESOL K-12
 Instructor: STEIN, HOLLIS G
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 644
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	6	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.44	4.28	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.38	4.23	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	****	4.54	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.42	4.20	4.35	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	545/1533	4.33	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.35	4.10	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	915/1623	4.17	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	782/1646	4.83	4.76	4.69	4.81	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	595/1621	4.33	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.48	4.28	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.37	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1352	****	4.09	3.98	4.10	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.51	4.08	4.30	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	699/ 948	3.50	4.36	3.95	4.03	3.50	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	34/ 88	4.80	4.61	4.54	4.63	4.80	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	28/ 85	4.80	4.63	4.47	4.50	4.80	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.47	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.53	4.35	4.42	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	173/ 288	3.75	3.82	3.68	3.87	3.75	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.64	4.06	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.22	4.09	4.47	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.36	4.38	4.44	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 645
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	723/1649	4.44	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	797/1648	4.33	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	****	4.54	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1139/1533	3.67	4.21	4.04	4.28	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	345/1512	4.56	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	321/1623	4.67	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	812/1621	4.14	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	636/1568	4.67	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	550/1564	4.60	4.48	4.28	4.41	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	284/1559	4.83	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	133/1352	4.80	4.09	3.98	4.10	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	437/1384	4.50	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	310/ 948	4.33	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.33	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	4.61	4.54	4.63	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	42/ 85	4.63	4.63	4.47	4.50	4.63	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	30/ 81	4.75	4.47	4.43	4.43	4.75	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	34/ 92	4.63	4.53	4.35	4.42	4.63	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	18/ 288	4.88	3.82	3.68	3.87	4.88	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.95	3.68	3.83	****	

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

Course-Section: EDUC 795 0101
 Title SEM STUDY TEACHING
 Instructor: SCHAFFER, EUGEN
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 646
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	433/1649	4.66	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1648	4.76	4.38	4.23	4.34	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1335/1595	3.99	4.42	4.20	4.35	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	815/1533	3.97	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	263/1512	4.60	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	720/1623	3.72	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1340/1646	4.64	4.76	4.69	4.81	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1261/1621	4.18	4.18	4.06	4.20	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1279/1568	4.35	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	4.97	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	854/1564	4.55	4.48	4.28	4.41	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1322/1559	4.16	4.37	4.29	4.41	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	326/1384	4.66	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1382	4.91	4.73	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1368	4.94	4.73	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	4.67	4.36	3.95	4.03	5.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 243	5.00	5.00	4.12	4.61	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 212	5.00	5.00	4.40	4.73	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 795 8720
 Title SEM STUDY TEACHING
 Instructor: SCHAFFER, EUGEN
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 647
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	12	4.65	459/1649	4.66	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	533/1648	4.76	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1375	****	4.54	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	759/1595	3.99	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	2	5	7	3.94	885/1533	3.97	4.21	4.04	4.28	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	366/1512	4.60	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	8	2	2	0	3	2	3.11	1520/1623	3.72	4.34	4.16	4.29	3.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	465/1646	4.64	4.76	4.69	4.81	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	207/1621	4.18	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	573/1568	4.35	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	355/1572	4.97	4.85	4.70	4.83	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	326/1564	4.55	4.48	4.28	4.41	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	536/1559	4.16	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	3	1	2	4	3.45	1075/1352	3.45	4.09	3.98	4.10	3.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	343/1384	4.66	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.65	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	322/1382	4.91	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	285/1368	4.94	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	0	2	2	10	4.33	310/ 948	4.67	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.33	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.61	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.63	4.47	4.50	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.47	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.53	4.35	4.42	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	1	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.82	3.68	3.87	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.64	4.06	4.51	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	232/ 312	3.40	3.95	3.68	3.83	3.40	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.37	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.49	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.92	****	

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	Graduate 7
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Under-grad 10
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Non-major 17
				Electives	0
#### - Means there are not enough					

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	14	
?	0			

Course-Section: EDUC 796 8010
 Title HUMAN PERF TECH
 Instructor: ERDMAN, CAROL B
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 648
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1376/1649	3.75	4.44	4.28	4.46	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	0	4	0	2.88	1607/1648	2.88	4.38	4.23	4.34	2.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1112/1375	3.75	4.54	4.27	4.44	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	1490/1595	3.25	4.42	4.20	4.35	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	1	5	4.00	815/1533	4.00	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1198/1623	3.88	4.34	4.16	4.29	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1608/1646	3.88	4.76	4.69	4.81	3.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	2	0	1	0	2.00	1610/1621	2.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	2.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	1	4	0	2.88	1539/1568	2.88	4.52	4.43	4.52	2.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1121/1572	4.63	4.85	4.70	4.83	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	3	1	1	3.00	1496/1564	3.00	4.48	4.28	4.41	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1415/1559	3.38	4.37	4.29	4.41	3.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	1328/1352	2.25	4.09	3.98	4.10	2.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	901/1384	3.88	4.51	4.08	4.30	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	740/1382	4.38	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	667/ 948	3.63	4.36	3.95	4.03	3.63
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.95	3.68	3.83	****

Frequency Distribution

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