Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION

Instructor: OLIVA, LINDA M.

Enrollment: 20

Questionnaires: 15

FION Baltimore County Fall 2008

I

0

1

Page 575 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

							Fre	eque	ncies	\$		Inst	tructor	Cours	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	2	0	2	4	7	3.93	1245/164	9 4.28	4.44	4.28	4.27	3.93
_	-	ctor make clear			0	0	1	0	4	4	6		1197/164			4.23		3.93
		uestions reflec			0	9	0	0	1	0	5		401/137			4.27		4.67
		uations reflect			1	0	1	2	1	3	7		1175/159				4.21	3.93
				what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	1	7	3.67	1139/153	3 3.70	4.21	4.04	4.05	3.67
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	4	6	3.93	980/151	2 4.17	4.35	4.10	4.11	3.93
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	1	1	3	4	6	3.87	1204/162	3 4.04	4.34	4.16	4.08	3.87
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	977/164	6 4.68	4.76	4.69	4.67	4.71
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	0	2	0	4	2	2	3.20	1463/162	1 4.04	4.18	4.06	4.02	3.20
		Lectur	е															
		uctor's lecture			2	0	2	0	2	4	5	3.77	1398/156	8 4.06	4.52	4.43	4.39	3.77
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	1273/157	2 4.65	4.85	4.70	4.64	4.46
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	2	0	2	0	3	1	7	3.85	1251/156	4 4.24	4.48	4.28		3.85
		es contribute t			2	0	1	1	2	2			1121/155					4.00
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	1	2	0	6	1	3	3.25	1160/135	2 3.91	4.09	3.98	3.97	3.25
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	901/138	4 4.58	4.51	4.08	4.11	3.88
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	7	0	1	1	1	0	5	3.88	1042/138	2 4.63	4.73	4.29	4.37	3.88
		_		d open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	654/136	8 4.83	4.73	4.30	4.39	4.50
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		7	3	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	578/ 94	8 4.14	4.36	3.95	4.00	3.80
		Labora	_															
5. Were r	requireme	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	10	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	282/ 55	5 4.60	4.64	4.29	4.22	4.60
		Semina																
5. Were c	riteria :	for grading mad	e clear	•	13	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 28	8 ****	3.82	3.68	3.58	****
		Field																
				hat you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	, -			4.06	3.59	4.67
_		-		uation criteria	9	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83				4.09	4.21	3.83
		ctor available			9	0	0	0	0	1		4.83				4.47		4.83
		could you disc s help you carr		r evaluations ield activities	9 5	3 3	0 1	1	2	0 5	0 1	3.71	****/ 3 200/ 31			4.38	4.32	
		7 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 -	, , , , ,				- 											
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Т	ype			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 8		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	jor	 s	0	 Gradua	 te	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В 3														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 1		Gei	nera:	1				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		Ele	ectiv	ves				1			there a		_	jh
				P 0								0	respon	ses to	be sign	nificar	nt	
				<b>-</b> ∧		0+1					1	2						

Other

12

University of Maryland INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION

Title Instructor: BOURNE, BARBARA

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 13 Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 576 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eaner	ncies	3		Insi	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	1 21	012/1640	1 20	1 11	1 20	4 27	1 21
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1 4	1 3	9 6	4.31		4.28	4.44	4.28	4.27 4.18	4.31 4.15
<ol> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> <li>Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals</li> </ol>	0	9	0	0	0	1	3	4.15	1010/1648 296/1375	4.16 4.58	4.38 4.54	4.23 4.27	4.10	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	5	4		1067/1595		4.42	4.27	4.22	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	3	4		1228/1533		4.42		4.21	3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	782/1512	4.17		4.10	4.11	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	2	6		1216/1623	4.17	4.35 4.34	4.16	4.11	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	7		1166/1646		4.76	4.16		4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50				4.05		4.50
Lecture	0	0	0	0	1	2	-	4 1 5	1100/1560	4 06	4 50	4 42	4 20	4 1 5
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	3	7		1198/1568		4.52	4.43	4.39	4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	•	0	1	1	1	9		1241/1572		4.85	4.70	4.64	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	3 1	8 9	4.38	801/1564	4.24		4.28	4.25	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0 1	0	0	2	1 2	3	-	4.31	931/1559 805/1352		4.37	4.29 3.98	4.23 3.97	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	U	U	2	2	3	Э	3.92	805/1352	3.91	4.09	3.98	3.97	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1384		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		4.30	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		****/ 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	****
Combiner														
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		****/ 81	****	4.47	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 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	****
T. 11 1														
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
-	0	0	1	2	2	2	6		- , -					
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	4	0	0	1	2	6	3.77		3.68	4.22	4.09	4.21	3.77
	0		0		1	2	5	4.56	20/ 39	4.57	4.60	4.47	4.43	4.56
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	3 3	0	2	1	3	5 4	4.00	27/ 39 174/ 312	4.00 3.82	4.36 3.95	4.38	4.32	4.00 3.90
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	U	3	U	4	1	3	4	3.90	1/4/ 312	3.02	3.95	3.00	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	****

Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION

Instructor: E

Questionnaires: 13

BOURNE, BARBARA

Enrollment: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 576 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9	-			
				?	1						

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

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	Ο	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		4.76	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		4.48	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			3.98	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		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		****/ 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		3.95	3.68	3.60	3.83

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 311 0101 University of Maryland Title PSYC FOUNDATION OF EDU

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI Enrollment: 25

Questionnaires: 18

Page 578 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equei	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 General																
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil		this course	1	0	0	1	4	7	5	3.94	1236/1649	3.97	4.44	4.28	4.27	3.94
_	-	ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	4	7	6		1054/1648	4.32	4.38	4.23	4.18	4.12
		estions reflect			1	12	0	0	1	1	3		665/1375		4.54		4.22	4.40
		ations reflect			2	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38		4.45	4.42	4.20	4.21	4.38
		eadings contribu			1	1	0	3	3	5	5		1065/1533	3.88	4.21	4.04	4.05	3.75
				what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	8	6	4.19	764/1512	4.27	4.35	4.10	4.11	4.19
		system clearly			1	0	0	1	4	3	9		904/1623	4.45	4.34	4.16	4.08	4.18
		was class cance			2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	465/1646	4.92	4.76	4.69	4.67	4.94
				ing effectiveness	6	0	0	0	4	6	2		1123/1621				4.02	
		Lecture																
1 Were ti	he instru	actor's lectures		repared	1	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	891/1568	4.51	4.52	4.43	4.39	4.47
		ctor seem intere	_	_	1	0	0	0	2	1	14		1022/1572		4.85	4.70	4.64	4.71
		cerial presented			1	0	0	0	2	3		4.59	570/1564		4.48	4.28	4.25	4.59
		es contribute to			1	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	881/1559		4.37	4.29	4.23	
				ur understanding	3	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20				3.98	3.97	
5. Did au	lalovisual	tecnniques enn	ance yo	ur understanding	3	U	U	U	4	4	/	4.20	556/1352	4.16	4.09	3.98	3.97	4.20
		Discuss																
		ussions contribu			12	0	0	0	0	2	4		326/1384		4.51	4.08	4.11	4.67
2. Were a	ll studen	nts actively enc	ouraged	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 th	e instruc	ctor encourage f	air 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 s	special te	echniques succes	sful		12	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	203/ 948	4.54	4.36	3.95	4.00	4.50
		Laborat	ory															
5. Were r	equiremen	nts for lab repo	rts cle	arly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	***	4.64	4.29	4.22	****
		Seminar																
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading made	clear		14	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.82	3.68	3.58	****
		Field W	lork															
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carry	out fi	eld activities	14	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 312	****	3.95	3.68	3.60	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									
Credits E		Charm CDA		The second of the second of				Da					m				Mada	
	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades					asons				Ту]	pe 			Majors 	; 
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 9		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В 3														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera!	l				2	Under-g	rad 1	8	Non-	-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - I				_	ıh
				P 0									response	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
				I 0		Oth	ner				1	1						
				? 1														

Title PSYC FOUNDATION OF EDU

Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 579 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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		4.73	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		4.88
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	****
The arm		- 54	2 1											

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	18	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				Р	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	-		_	

? 1

Course-Section: EDUC 313 0101 Title

University of Maryland PEER ASSISTED LRNING I Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: BICHY, CASSIE J

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 580 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	- lls from	m 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	e instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	pected 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	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the ex	xpected goals	0	4	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1208/1375	3.50	4.54	4.27	4.22	3.50
		ations reflect			0	2	0	0	2	0	2		1067/1595		4.42	4.20	4.21	4.00
				what you learned	0	1	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	1518/1533	2.40	4.21	4.04	4.05	2.40
				what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	2	0		1470/1512		4.35	4.10	4.11	2.83
		g system clearl		ined	0	0	0	0	0	4			720/1623	4.33	4.34	4.16	4.08	4.33
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1646		4.76	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	2	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1504/1621	3.00	4.18	4.06	4.02	3.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well p	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	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested in	n 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 led	cture mat	erial presente	d and ex	xplained 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	e lecture	es contribute t	o 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 aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	1	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1101/1352	3.40	4.09	3.98	3.97	3.40
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1384	****	4.51	4.08	4.11	****
				d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1382		4.73	4.29	4.37	****
				d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1368		4.73	4.30	4.39	****
		chniques succe		a open disodssion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 948		4.36	3.95	4.00	****
		Labora	+0237															
5. Were re	equiremen			early specified	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.22	****
J. NOTO 1	04411001.	_		Sally Specifica		· ·	Ū	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	1.00	, 555		1.01	1.27		
5 Did do	nferences	Field		ield activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 312	****	2 05	3 68	3 60	****
5. Dia coi	interences	neip you carr	y Out I.	ieid activities	5	U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	/ 312		3.95	3.00	3.00	
				Frequ	ency	7 Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	1
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 6		Per	anir		 or Ma	jors		0	 Graduat		0	 Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		1000	~~~~	-u -l	- 1·1C	د د د د		J	Sidduat	_	5	1.101.00	-	U
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		061	иста.	-				J	onacr -g	_ uu	•	14011		J
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		E14	ecti	zes				2	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	rh
craa.	Ü	3.30 1.00	3	P 0								-	respons				_	
				I O		O+1	her					4	TCDPOHD	LO L	5191			
				3 0		001						-						

Course-Section: EDUC 314 0101 Universititle PEER ASSISTED LRNING I Bal

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				MD	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies	3	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Quescions	, 							·		Mean			Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	-															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,skil	.ls fro	m 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 th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1313/1648	3.80	4.38	4.23	4.18	3.80
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflect	the e	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 ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	818/1595	4.25	4.42	4.20	4.21	4.25
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	ite 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
5. Did wr	itten as	signments contri	bute t	o 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 th	e grading	g system clearly	expla expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.34	4.16	4.08	4.00
B. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overal	l tead	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1429/1621	3.33	4.18	4.06	4.02	3.33
		Lecture	2															
. Were t	he instr	uctor'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
. Did th	e instru	ctor seem intere	ested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1071/1572	4.67	4.85	4.70	4.64	4.67
. Was le	cture mat	terial presented	l and e	explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	854/1564	4.33	4.48	4.28	4.25	4.33
. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to	what	you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	901/1559	4.33	4.37	4.29	4.23	4.3
. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1130/1352	3.33	4.09	3.98	3.97	3.3
		Discuss	sion															
l. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribu	ite 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
. Were a	ll stude	nts actively end	courage	d 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 th	e instru	ctor encourage f	air an	d 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 s	pecial to	echniques succes	sful	-	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.36	3.95	4.00	5.00
		Seminar	•															
5. Were c	riteria :	for grading made	e clear	•	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	3.82	3.68	3.58	****
		Field W	Jork															
5. Did co	nference	s help you carry	out f	ield activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.95	3.68	3.60	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	\$			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А 5		Re	auir	ed f	or Ma	iors	 5	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0						,,	-	-		-	-	) (		,
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				3	Under-q	rad	5	Non-	-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			u	_				-	011401 9		-	2.011		3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		E1.	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here s	re not	enous	rh
craa.	J	3.30 1.00	1	P 0		111	CCCI	v CD				J	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		,			
				I O		O+1	her					2	T CDPOILD	-2 CO L	5191			
				1 0		00.						_						

? 0

Course-Section: EDUC 387 0101 University of Maryland Title TUTORING AND LITERACY Baltimore County

Instructor: TAYLOR, JOBY B

Enrollment: 7

Questionnaires: 7

Fall 2008

Page 582

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

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

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	0	0	0	0	0	_	7	F 00	1 /1 6 4 0	F 00	4 4 4	4 00	4 07	F 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7 7	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.44	4.28	4.27	5.00
<ol> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> <li>Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals</li> </ol>	0	0 3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00 5.00	1/1648 1/1375	5.00 5.00	4.38 4.54	4.23	4.18 4.22	5.00 5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/15/5	5.00	4.42	4.27	4.22	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		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		4.18	4.06		4.43
J. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	o	Ü	_	O	O	Ü	Ü	1.15	103/1021	1.15	1.10	1.00	1.02	1.15
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	Λ	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	1/1384	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		4.36	3.95	4.00	
1. Nete special econicates successful	_	_	O	_	O	Ü	5	1.23	312, 310	1.25	1.50	3.75	1.00	1.25
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
From		. Dia	- wib	.+ : 0	<b>~</b>									

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

Title INCLUSION & INSTRUCTIO

WILSONCRAIG, GI

Instructor: Enrollment:

28 Questionnaires: 17

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 583 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

							Fre	equei	ncies			Inst	tructo	r	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rai	nk	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1																
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	w insights,ski		m this course	0	0	4	2	4	3	4	3.06	1598/	1649	3.06	4.44	4.28	4.27	3.06
		tor make clear			1	0	2	2	3	1	8		1395/		3.69	4.38	4.23	4.18	3.69
		estions reflec			2	11	0	1	0	0	3		****/		****	4.54	4.27	4.22	****
	_	ations reflect		_	0	1	2	3	1	2	8	3.69	1323/	1595	3.69	4.42	4.20	4.21	3.69
5. Did as	signed rea	adings contrib	ute to v	what you learned	0	0	4	0	3	4	6	3.47	1269/	1533	3.47	4.21	4.04	4.05	3.47
				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 th	e grading	system clearl	y expla:	ined	0	0	2	1	6	2	6	3.53	1379/	1623	3.53	4.34	4.16	4.08	3.53
8. How ma	ny times w	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	799/	1646	4.82	4.76	4.69	4.67	4.82
9. How wo	ould you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	1	0	4	2	6	1	3	2.81	1553/	1621	2.81	4.18	4.06	4.02	2.81
		Lectur	e																
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture		prepared	2	0	3	0	4	3	5	3.47	1468/	1568	3.47	4.52	4.43	4.39	3.47
		tor seem inter			2	0	1	0	0	5	9		1321/		4.40	4.85	4.70	4.64	4.40
				xplained clearly	2	0	3	0	4	3	5		1403/			4.48	4.28	4.25	3.47
		s contribute t		-	2	0	4	1	3	2			1448/		3.20	4.37	4.29	4.23	3.20
			-	our understanding	2	1	4	0	3	3			1173/					3.97	
		D																	
1 Did al	agg diggu	Discus		what you learned	11	0	2	0	0	1	3	2 50	1081/	1201	3.50	4.51	4.08	4.11	3.50
				d to participate	11	0	1	1	0	1	3		1146/		3.67	4.73	4.29	4.37	3.67
				d open discussion	11	0	2	0	0	1	3		1181/		3.50	4.73	4.29	4.37	3.50
		chniques succe		d open discussion	11	0	2	0	1	1			821/				3.95	4.00	
4. Wele S	pecial ter	cilliques succe	SSIUI		T.T.	U	4	U	1	1	4	3.11	021/	240	3.17	4.30	3.95	4.00	3.11
		Labora	-																
5. Were r	requirement	ts for lab rep	orts cle	early specified	13	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/	555	****	4.64	4.29	4.22	****
		Semina	r																
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading mad	e clear		14	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/	288	***	3.82	3.68	3.58	****
		Field	Work																
5. Did co	nferences			ield activities	11	0	0	1	0	5	0	3.67	207/	312	3.67	3.95	3.68	3.60	3.67
		2.35	- 1																
5. Were t	here enoug	Self :		ne students	14	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/	110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****
3. No. 20 0		gii p1000015 10						_	-	_	Ü	3.33	,				3.,,	1.05	
				Frequ	lency	Dist	tribu	ution	ı										
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons					Тур	pe			Majors	1
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 14		Red		ed fo	or Ma	iors	 S	0	Grad	duate	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1						,	-	-			-	-	) -		-
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ger	nera:	1				0	Unde	er-gi	rad 1	7	Non-	-major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D 0											_			3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	###:	# - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	h
	-		-	P 0											es to b			_	
				I O		Otł	ner				1	.6							

READ CONTNT AREA II

Title Instructor: WILLIAMS, NICOL

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 584

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fr	eque	ncies			Ins	tructo	r	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ra	nk	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 																
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil		this course	0	0	4	3	2	2	4	2.93	1614/	1649	2.93	4.44	4.28	4.50	2.93
_	-	ctor make clear			0	0	5	3	2	2	3		1625/		2.67		4.23	4.36	2.67
		uestions reflect	_	-	0	11	0	1	1	1	1		1208/		3.50	4.54	4.27	4.48	3.50
		uations reflect			0	0	2	5	2	2	4		1531/			4.42	4.20	4.36	3.07
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	0	1	2	4	3	2	3		1441/		3.00	4.21	4.04	4.14	3.00
				what you learned	0	1	3	3	2	3	3	3.00	1428/	1512	3.00	4.35	4.10	4.26	3.00
		g system clearly		_	0	3	2	3	2	2	3	3.08	1525/	1623	3.08	4.34	4.16	4.27	3.08
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	5	7	3	3.87	1609/	1646	3.87	4.76	4.69	4.71	3.87
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overal	ll teach	ing effectiveness	2	0	4	2	5	2	0	2.38	1598/	1621	2.38	4.18	4.06	4.24	2.38
		Lecture	9																
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures	well p	repared	1	0	3	3	2	5	1	2.86	1541/	1568	2.86	4.52	4.43	4.54	2.86
		ctor seem intere			1	0	2	2	3	3	4	3.36	1546/	1572	3.36	4.85	4.70	4.79	3.36
		terial presented		_	1	0	3	3	3	4	1	2.79	1528/	1564	2.79	4.48	4.28	4.40	2.79
		es contribute to			1	1	4	1	2	4	2	2.92	1498/	1559	2.92	4.37	4.29	4.41	2.92
			_	ur understanding	1	1	3	2	1	4	3	3.15	1192/	1352	3.15	4.09	3.98	4.07	3.15
		Discuss	sion																
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribu		hat vou learned	5	0	3	1	1	3	2	3.00	1254/	1384	3.00	4.51	4.08	4.35	3.00
		nts actively end			5	0	1	1	2	3	3		1175/		3.60	4.73	4.29	4.56	3.60
				open discussion	5	0	0	1	4	1	4		1071/		3.80	4.73	4.30	4.58	3.80
		echniques succes		of	5	3	3	0	1	1			885/			4.36	3.95		
		Laborat	orv																
2. Were v	ou provi		_	round information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	243	****	5.00	4.12	4.61	****
_	-	nts for lab repo	_		13	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/		***		4.29	4.41	***
		Seminar	2																
1. Were a	ssigned	topics relevant		announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	88	****	4.61	4.54	4.66	****
				vidual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/		****	4.63	4.47	4.54	****
		rojects contribu			14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/		****	4.47	4.43	4.57	****
	_	ons contribute t		-	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/		****	4.53	4.35	4.44	****
_		for grading made		7	11	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25		288	4.25	3.82	3.68		4.25
		Field W	Jork																
1. Did fi	eld expe	rience contribut		at vou learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	52	****	4.64	4.06	4.86	****
	_	y understand you		-	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/		****	4.22	4.09	4.42	****
_		s help you carry			8	1	0	3	0	3	0		256/		3.00	3.95	3.68		3.00
		Self E	Paced																
1. Did se	lf-paced	system contribu		hat you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	53	****	****	4.30	4.64	****
		tions make clear			14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****
		ugh proctors for			13	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	110	****	****	3.99	4.22	****
		J 1																	
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons					Тур	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11		Re	 quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	 3	0	Gra	 duate	======	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 2													-		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Und	er-gi	rad 1	.5	Non-	-major	15
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D 0		7						0	.0.00	ш -	foor = 1	bass-			-la
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	###	# - I	Means t	nere a	ire not	enoug	lu

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

ANALYSIS OF TCHNG & LR

Title 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	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	4 07	1126/1640	4 07	1 11	4 00	4 50	4 07
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0 T	2 1	2	8 11	4.07	1136/1649 300/1648	4.07 4.71	4.44	4.28	4.50 4.36	4.07 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	4.23	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	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	Τ	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		****/ 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		****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 88	****	4.61	4.54	4.66	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85	****	4.63	4.47	4.54	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 81	****	4.47	4.43	4.57	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.53	4.35	4.44	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	U	U	U	U	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		****/ 52	****	4.64	4.06	4.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	4.22	4.09	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	4.60	4.47	4.52	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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	****

Title ANALYSIS OF TCHNG & LR

Instructor:

ANALYSIS OF TCHNG & L. WILLIAMS, VICKI

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 585 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	-			
				?	0						

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 586

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Fall 2008

Course-Section: EDUC 416 0101 University of Maryland Title MATERIALS TCH READ Instructor: YOUNG, PATRICIA

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

8

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fro	_	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera																
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.44	4.28	4.50	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	182/1648	4.86	4.38	4.23	4.36	4.86
		uestions reflec			0	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.54	4.27	4.48	5.00
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	272/1595		4.42	4.20	4.36	4.71
	_	-		what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	241/1533		4.21	4.04	4.14	4.67
		_		o what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	595/1512		4.35	4.10	4.26	4.33
		g system clearl		ined	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	,		4.34	4.16	4.27	4.57
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	2		4.71			4.76	4.69	4.71	4.71
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	II tead	hing effectiveness	2	1	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1192/1621	3.75	4.18	4.06	4.24	3.75
		T a a b	_															
1 77		Lectur			^	0	^	^	^	0	_	F 00	1 /1 5 6 0	F 00	4 50	4 42	4 - 4	F 00
		uctor's lecture ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1568 1/1572		4.52 4.85	4.43	4.54 4.79	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	216/1564		4.85	4.70	4.79	4.86
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	2		4.71	448/1559	4.71	4.40	4.29	4.40	4.71
				our understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0		4.71	-,			3.98	4.41	4.71
J. DIG at	udiovisua	i teciniiques en	nance y	our understanding	U	U	U	U		U	O	4./1	1///1352	4./1	4.09	3.90	4.07	4./1
		Discus	gion															
1 Did cl	lagg digc			what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	175/1384	4.86	4.51	4.08	4.35	4.86
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1382		4.73	4.29	4.56	5.00
				d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.58	5.00
		echniques succe		a open arroarron	0	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	281/ 948		4.36	3.95	4.31	4.40
		1				_	-	-	_	_	_							
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Re	guir	ed f	or M	 ajors		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1			-			-						3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0													-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		El	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	gh
				P 0									respons	es to k	oe sigr	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Ot!	her					4	-					
				? 0														

Course-Section: EDUC 417 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County PROC & ACQUIS READ YOUNG, PATRICIA Fall 2008

Instructor: Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 13

Title

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 587

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

								Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 l																
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,skil	lls from th	is course		1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	433/1649	4.67	4.44	4.28	4.50	4.67
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the expect	ed goals		2	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	756/1648	4.36	4.38	4.23	4.36	4.36
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflect	the expec	ted goals		2	5	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.54	4.27	4.48	4.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the expect	ed goals		1	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.42	4.20	4.36	4.67
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contribu	ite to what	you learı	ned	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	95/1533	4.92	4.21	4.04	4.14	4.92
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contri	ibute to wh	at you lea	arned	1	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	324/1512	4.58	4.35	4.10	4.26	4.58
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearly	y explained	l		1	0	0	1	3	1	7	4.17	915/1623	4.17	4.34	4.16	4.27	4.17
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled			1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	913/1646	4.75	4.76	4.69	4.71	4.75
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overal	ll teaching	effective	eness	2	1	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1060/1621	3.90	4.18	4.06	4.24	3.90
		Lecture	2																
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures	s well prep	ared		2	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	1239/1568	4.09	4.52	4.43	4.54	4.09
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem intere	ested in th	e subject		2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	815/1572	4.82	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.82
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presented	d and expla	ined clear	rly	2	0	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	1219/1564	3.91	4.48	4.28	4.40	3.91
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute to	o 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 au	ıdiovisua	l techniques enh	nance your	understand	ding	2	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	501/1352	4.27	4.09	3.98	4.07	4.27
		Discuss	sion																
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contribu	ite to what	you learı	ned	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	228/1384	4.78	4.51	4.08	4.35	4.78
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively end	couraged to	participa	ate	4	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	483/1382	4.67	4.73	4.29	4.56	4.67
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage f	fair and op	en discus	sion	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	285/1368	4.89	4.73	4.30	4.58	4.89
4. Were s	special t	echniques succes	ssful			4	2	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	330/ 948	4.29	4.36	3.95	4.31	4.29
		Laborat	tory																
1. Did th	ne lab in	crease understar	nding of th	ne materia	1	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.73	****
					Freque	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									
Credits E	Tarned	Cum. GPA	ū	Expected G	rades				Do:	asons	,			Ty	ne			Majors	
CIECTICS F			<u></u>	·							, 				 be				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8			Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			_							1	, .				
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 1			Gei	neral	L				1	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0															

Electives

Other

0

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

F

Ρ

I

0

0

0

Course-Section: EDUC 418 0101 Title

INSTRUCTION OF READING

Instructor: SHELTON, NANCY

Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 2

# Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 588 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

							Fr	equei	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	w insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.44	4.28	4.50	5.00
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.38	4.23	4.36	5.00
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	5.00		4.27	4.48	5.00
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1595	5.00		4.20	4.36	5.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.21	4.04	4.14	5.00
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512		4.35	4.10	4.26	5.00
		system clearl			0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1623	5.00	4.34	4.16	4.27	
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.71	
	-			hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1		374/1621				4.24	
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.54	5.00
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1564		4.48	4.28	4.40	5.00
		s contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1559	5.00	4.37	4.29	4.41	
				our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1352				4.07	
J. Dia au	alovibuai	ccciniiques en	manec y	our understanding	O	Ü	O	O	O	O	2	3.00	1/1552	3.00	1.05	3.70	1.07	3.00
		Discus																
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384		4.51	4.08	4.35	5.00
		_	_	ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.56	5.00
				nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.58	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.36	3.95	4.31	5.00
		Labora	tory															
5. Were r	equiremen	ts for lab rep	orts cl	early 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 fi	eld exper	ience contribu	te to w	hat 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 yo	u clearly	understand yo	ur eval	uation 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	e instruc	tor available	for cor	sultation	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.60	4.47	4.52	5.00
4. To wha	t degree	could you disc	uss you	ır evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.36	4.38	4.59	5.00
5. Did co	nferences	help you carr	y out f	ield activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 312	5.00	3.95	3.68	3.95	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	;
				·										- 				
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 0 B 1		Red	quir	ed i	or Ma	jors	5	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55 56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	В 1 С 1		Cos	nera	1				0	IIndon ~	rad	2	Non	madom	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		Gei	пета	т				U	Under-g	Lau	۷	NOI1-	-major	۷
84-150 Grad.	0	3.50-3.49	0	D 0 F 0		. וים	ecti <sup>.</sup>	a				0	#### - I	Moana +	horo	vo not	onoma	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	U	P 0		₽.T.¢	=CLT	veb				U	response				_	111
				I 0		O+1	her					2	r caboug.	LD LU L	o argi	ııı ı Cal.	10	
				<u> </u>		OLI	TET					4						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: EDUC 419 0101

7

ASSESS READING

SHELTON, NANCY

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

Fall 2008

Page 589

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	-	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
		Genera	L															
_	_	ew insights,ski			1		0	0	1	1	4	4.50		4.50	4.44	4.28	4.50	4.50
		ctor make clear	_	_	1		0	1	0	2	3	4.17	999/1648	4.17	4.38	4.23	4.36	4.17
		estions reflect			1	-	0	0	0	0	3		1/1375	5.00	4.54		4.48	5.00
		ations reflect			1		0	1	0	1		4.33	722/1595	4.33	4.42	4.20	4.36	4.33
				hat you learned	1		0	0	1	1		4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.21	4.04	4.14	4.50
		_		what you learned			0	0	0	2		4.67		4.67	4.35	4.10	4.26	4.67
		g system clearly	-	ned	1		0	1	1	0		4.17		4.17	4.34	4.16	4.27	4.17
		was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	2			1037/1646			4.69	4.71	
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	3 2	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.18	4.06	4.24	4.50
_		Lecture			_						_							
		actor's lectures	_	-	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52			
		ctor seem intere			2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1572		4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00
				plained clearly	2	0		0	1	0		4.60	550/1564	4.60	4.48	4.28	4.40	4.60
		es contribute to	_		2	0	0	0	1	0 1		4.60	586/1559	4.60	4.37	4.29	4.41	
5. Did au	alovisual	techniques en	nance yo	our understanding	2	U	0	0	2	Τ	2	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.09	3.98	4.07	4.00
		Discuss																
1 544				Jane 1	4	0	^	0	^	^	2	F 00	1 /1204	F 00	4 51	4 00	4 25	F 00
				hat you learned	4	-	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384 1/1382	5.00	4.51	4.08	4.35	5.00 5.00
				l to participate	4		0	0	0	0	3		,					
		_		l open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1368 1/ 948	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.58 4.31	5.00
4. were s	special te	echniques succes	SSLUI		4	U	U	U	U	U	3	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.30	3.95	4.31	5.00
				Free	quency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	:			Re:	ason	q			Туј	ne.			Majors	
					, 									,. 				, . – – – –
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduate	9	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2			-			,								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D 0									_				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoue	jh
				P 0									response					
				I 0		Ot!	her					6	_		3			
				? 0														

Course-Section: EDUC 420 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 TEACH MATH IN ELEM SCH Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: ALBRIGHT, DEBOR

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 7

_			
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Page 590

		Question	S		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera			•		_	•	•	_	_		000/4540			4 00	4 50	
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	372/1649	4.71	4.44	4.28	4.50	4.71
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	182/1648	4.86	4.38	4.23	4.36	4.86
	_	uestions reflec		1 3	0	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.54	4.27	4.48	5.00
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	162/1595	4.86	4.42	4.20	4.36	4.86
				what you learned	0	-	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	128/1533	4.86	4.21	4.04	4.14	4.86
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	225/1512		4.35	4.10	4.26	4.71
		g system clearl		ined	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	427/1623	4.57	4.34	4.16	4.27	4.57
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	977/1646		4.76	4.69	4.71	
9. How wo	ow would you grade the overall teaching effection  Lecture  ere the instructor's lectures well prepared			hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	191/1621	4.71	4.18	4.06	4.24	4.71
		Logtur	_															
1 Were t	he instri		_	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.54	5.00
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	0	5		1/1572		4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00
				xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	4		263/1564		4.48	4.28	4.40	4.80
		es contribute t			2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	586/1559	4.60	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.60
				our understanding	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	399/1352		4.09	3.98	4.07	4.40
3. 21a aa	a10115441	1 000111114000 011	ilalioo j	our under seamaring	_	ŭ	ŭ	Ü	_	_		1.10	333, 1332	1.10	1.05	3.70	2.07	1.10
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute 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
				d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.56	5.00
				d 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 s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	-	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.36	3.95	4.31	5.00
	_	-																
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ıtioı	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	1
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 0	 А б		Red	 mir		or Ma	iore		0	Graduat		0	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1		1000	70TT	-u 10	) I 1/1C	، ١٠٠٠	,		JIdduac	_	J	1.10. ) (	<b>,</b> _	U
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	l				0	Under-q	rad	7	Non-	major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D 0		001	u.	-				•	onder 9.		•	1,011		,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		E14	ectiv	7es				0	#### - 1	Means +	here a	re not	enous	h
oraa.	0	3.30 1.00	_	P 0		111	CI	,					respons				_	
				I O		O+1	her					7	T CBPOHS		,c 5191.	ıııcaı		
				1 0		OLI	TCT					,						

0

Course-Section: EDUC 421 0101 University of Maryland Title TCHNG SCIENCE: ELEM SC

Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN

Enrollment: 10

Questionnaires: 8

Page 591 Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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		4.35	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		4.76	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	****
Freq	iency	Dist	cribu	ıtioı	n									
_	_													
Cradita Farnad Cum CDA Exposted Crades				Do.	aaan	٠,			Т. г.	00			Majora	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: EDUC 422 0101 University of Maryland Title SOCIAL STUDIES: ELEM S

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 592

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: FITZHUGH, WILLI Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 7 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
1 541		Genera		4.1-4	_	0	0	0	^	1	_	1 00	020/1640	4 06	4 44	4 00	4 50	4 06
		w insights,ski			0	0	0	0	0	1 0	6 7	4.86	230/1649		4.44	4.28	4.50	4.86
		tor make clear estions reflec			-	5	0	0	0	0	2		1/1648			4.23	4.36	5.00
					0	1	0	0	1	0	_		1/1375			4.27	4.48	5.00
4. DIG OU	ner evalu	ations reflect	tne ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0		4.67		4.67 4.71		4.20	4.36	4.67 4.71
				what you learned		-	-	-		-		4.71				4.04		
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.86	133/1512			4.10	4.26	4.86
		system clearl		ained	U	0	•	•	•	•		5.00	1/1623			4.16	4.27	5.00
		was class canc		1. 55	0	0	0	0	0	3			1130/1646		4.76	4.69		4.57
9. How wor	ula you g	rade the overa	II tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	U	0	0	1	6	4.86	113/1621	4.86	4.18	4.06	4.24	4.86
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	387/1568	4.80	4.52	4.43	4.54	4.80
		tor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	2			1146/1572			4.70	4.79	4.60
				explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1		4.80	263/1564			4.28	4.40	4.80
		s contribute t			2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80		4.80	4.37		4.41	4.80
				our understanding	2	0	0	1	1	0		4.00	690/1352			3.98		4.00
		1000																
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute 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 a	ll studen	ts actively en	courage	ed to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	483/1382	4.67	4.73	4.29	4.56	4.67
				nd 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 s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful	-	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.36	3.95	4.31	5.00
	_	Labora																
5. Were r	equiremen	ts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.41	****
		Field	Monle															
E Did an	nforongog			ield activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	68/ 312	4 00	2 0 5	2 60	2 05	4 00
5. Dia co	nrerences	neip you carr	y out 1	lieid activities	5	U	U	U	U	2	U	4.00	00/ 312	4.00	3.95	3.00	3.95	4.00
		Self	Paced															
5. Were t	here enou			he students	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.22	****
		5 1											,					
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	utior	1									
G 14 b 17		G GDA		The stand Country				ъ.					m-				24	
Credits E	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	; 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	. <b></b> .
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	auire	ed fo	or Ma	iors	5	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0						J								
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									5				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ah
	-			P 0									respons					•
				I O		Ot.ì	ner					3					-	
				? 1														

Course-Section: EDUC 424 0101

ISSUES IN EC CURRICULU

Title Instructor: SMALL, SUE ELLE

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 7

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 593 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie				tructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	Λ	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		4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	0	3		1001/1564		4.48	4.28	4.40	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	1		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		1049/1352		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		4.73	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		4.63	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		3.82	3.68	3.71	4.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	tribı	ution	า									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	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	Ī
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	5	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: EDUC 425 0101 University of Maryland Title TCHNG ENGLISH: SEC SCHO Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: NORTH-COLEMAN,

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 594

	Questions				MD	NA	Fro	_	ncies	5	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	_		Level Mean	
		Question	5 		NIX.	NA				<del></del>		меан	Ralik	Mean	Mean	Mean	меан	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	- lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.44	4.28	4.50	5.00
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.38	4.23	4.36	5.00
		estions reflec			0	1	0	0	0	0	1		1/1375	5.00	4.54	4.27	4.48	5.00
		uations reflect			1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.42	4.20	4.36	5.00
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.21	4.04	4.14	5.00
	-	_		what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.35	4.10	4.26	5.00
		g system clearl			1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.34	4.16	4.27	5.00
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.76	4.69	4.71	4.00
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.18	4.06	4.24	5.00
1. Were t	Lecture ere the instructor's lectures well prepared id the instructor seem interested in the subject				1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.54	5.00
2. Did th	id 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 le	as lecture material presented and explained clear			xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.48	4.28	4.40	5.00
4. Did th	as lecture material presented and explained clear id the lectures contribute to what you learned			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 au	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi			our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.09	3.98	4.07	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass discu	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	all studer	nts actively en	courage	d 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 th	ne instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d 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 s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.36	3.95	4.31	5.00
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	\$
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 1 B 1		ке	quir	ea I	or Ma	a Jor:	5	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	DT.	0
28-55 56-83	0	2.00-1.99	0	B 1 C 0		C	nera	1				0	Under-q	h a	2	More	ma i a	2
56-83 84-150	1	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	1	D 0		Gei	nera.	Т				U	under-g	Lau	4	NON-	-major	۷
84-150 Grad.	0	3.50-3.49	0	Б 0 F 0		. רים	ecti					0	#### - 1	Moana +	horo a	vo not	ono	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	U	P 0		E16	ecrl,	ves				U	respons				_	ìII
				I O		O+1	har					2	respons	co LU L	e sigi	ııı ı Cal.	10	
				5 U		ULI	TICI					4						
				f U	Other													

Course-Section: EDUC 426 0101 University of Maryland

Title MATH IN SECONDARY SCHO Baltimore County Fall 2008 Instructor: ALBRIGHT, DEBOR

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 3

a. 1 .	~			
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestion	ınaıre

Page 595

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

			Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst: Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			General	 															
1. Di	d vou	gain ne	ew insights,skil	=	this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.44	4.28	4.50	5.00
			ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1648		4.38	4.23	4.36	5.00
			uestions reflect	_	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.54	4.27	4.48	5.00
4. Di	d othe	er evalı	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.42	4.20	4.36	5.00
5. Di	ld assi	gned re	eadings contribu	ıte to v	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. Di	d writ	ten ass	signments contri	bute 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. Wa	as the	grading	g system clearly	explai	ned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.34	4.16	4.27	5.00
8. Ho	w many	times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. Ho	w woul	d you	grade the overal	ll teach	ning effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.18	4.06	4.24	5.00
			Lecture	9															
			uctor's lectures			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1568		4.52	4.43	4.54	5.00
			ctor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00
					plained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.48	4.28	4.40	5.00
			es contribute to	_		0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559		4.37	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Di	ld audi	lovisua	l techniques enh	nance yo	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.09	3.98	4.07	5.00
			Discuss	sion															
1. Di	d clas	s disc	ussions contribu	ite to v	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.51	4.08	4.35	5.00
					l to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.56	5.00
3. Di	d the	instru	ctor encourage f	air and	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.58	5.00
4. We	ere spe	ecial te	echniques succes	ssful	_	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.36	3.95	4.31	5.00
			Seminar	£															
5. We	ere cri	teria 1	for grading made	e clear		2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.82	3.68	3.71	4.00
					Frequ	ıency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credi	ts Ear	ned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-2	 )7	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Per	 mir	 ed f	or Ma	ior		0	 Graduat		0	Majo		0
28-5		0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0		100	-1 VIII	- L	OT 1-1C	، ۱۰۰۰	~	-	Siddudi	_	•	114 )	-	3
56-8		0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	3
84-1		2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0				_				-	311461 9		-	2.021		-
Grad		0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
					Р 0									respons				_	
					I O		Otl	her					3	-		3			
					? 0														

Course-Section: EDUC 427 0101 University of Maryland Title SCIENCE: SECONDARY SCHO

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: SINGER, JONATHA Enrollment: 3

Questionnaires: 3

Page 596 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

							Fr	equei	ncies	\$		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1 Did vo	on gain ne	w insights,ski		m this course	0	0	Ο	0	0	1	2	4.67	433/1649	4.67	4.44	4.28	4.50	4.67
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	362/1648	4.67	4.38	4.23	4.36	4.67
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.42	4.20	4.36	4.67
5. Did as	ssigned re	adings contrib	ute 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 wr	ritten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o 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 th	ne grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.34	4.16	4.27	4.50
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How wo	ould you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.18	4.06	4.24	4.00
		Lecture	e															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures		orepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1050/1568	4.33	4.52	4.43	4.54	4.33
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1071/1572	4.67	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.67
3. Was le	ecture mat	erial presented	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	473/1564	4.67	4.48	4.28	4.40	4.67
4. Did th	ne lecture	s contribute to	o 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 av	udiovisual	techniques enl	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	208/1352	4.67	4.09	3.98	4.07	4.67
		Discus	gion															
1 Did cl	lagg digen			what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1384	4.50	4.51	4.08	4.35	4.50
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.56	5.00
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.58	5.00
		chniques succes			1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	431/ 948		4.36	3.95		4.00
		Talaassa	<b>.</b>															
5 Were r	reguiremen	Laborates for lab repo	-	early specified	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	388/ 555	4.00	4 64	4.29	4 41	4.00
3. Mere 1		101 102 105	0100 01	odily brooffied	-	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ū	_	Ü	1.00	300, 333	1.00	1.01	1.27		1.00
		Field W																
				hat you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.64	4.06	4.86	5.00
				uation criteria	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	41/ 48	3.00	4.22	4.09	4.42	3.00
		tor available :			2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	39/ 39	3.00	4.60		4.52	3.00
		could you disc			2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	27/ 39	4.00	4.36	4.38	4.59	4.00
5. Did co	onferences	help you carry	y out f	ield activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.95	3.68	3.95	4.00
				Frequ	.ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	<b>:</b>			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ijors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1				_				_			_			_
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	Ι				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	2
84-150	1 0	3.00-3.49	3 0	D 0 F 0		. רקד	0a+ -					0	#### - 1	Moona +	howo -	*** ***	0001-	h
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	U	F 0		FT6	ecti	ves				U	respons				_	11
				I O		O+1	her					3	respons	ca LU L	e sign	ıııcalı		
				? 0		001						5						
				. 0														

Course-Section: EDUC 428 0101 University of Maryland Title SOCIAL STUDIES: SEC SC Baltimore County

Title SOCIAL STUDIES: SEC SC Instructor: JAKOVICS, KIMBE

Enrollment: 7

Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 597 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires: 7 Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 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 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 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 3 4 4.57 331/1512 4.57 4.35 4.10 4.26 4.577. 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 7 5.00 1/1646 5.00 4.76 4.69 4.71 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  $0 \quad 0$ 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 00 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 1 0 2 0 3.33 208/ 288 3.33 3.82 3.68 3.71 3.33 Field Work 6 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 312 \*\*\*\* 3.95 3.68 3.95 \*\*\*\* 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities

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

Course-Section: EDUC 429 0101 University of Maryland Title TEACH FORGN LANG SEC S

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 598 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: OSKOZ, ANA

Enrollment: 3 Ouestionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Ouestions Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 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 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 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 2 5.00 1/1533 5.00 4.21 4.04 4.14 5.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  $1 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 2 \quad 5.00$ 1/1512 5.00 4.35 4.10 4.26 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 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 4.50Lecture 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 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 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 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  $1 \quad 0 \quad 0$ 1/1368 5.00 4.73 4.30 4.58 5.00 0 0 0 2 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

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

Course-Section: EDUC 442 0101 University of Maryland Title PROCESS SEM ECE - MEDI

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 599 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: COSTELLO, MARGA Enrollment: 8 Ouestionnaires: 8 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 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 4.007. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 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 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 1 1 4.50 616/1382 4.50 4.73 4.29 4.56 4.50 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 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 Majors Reasons \_\_\_\_\_\_ 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Graduate 0 Major 0 Required for Majors 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 28-55 2 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 General 0 Under-grad 8 Non-major 8 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other

Course-Section: EDUC 443 0101 University of Maryland Title

PROCESS SEM: ECE-M/S I

Instructor: RIVKIN, MARY

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 7

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Baltimore County

Page 600 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

						Fre	eque	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew 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
		ctor make clear the		0	0	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	1517/1648	3.43	4.38	4.23	4.36	3.43
		uations reflect the		0	1	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1335/1595	3.67	4.42	4.20	4.36	3.67
5. Did as	signed r	eadings 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 wr	ritten as:	signments contribut	e 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 th	ne gradin	g system clearly ex	plained	0	1	3	0	2	1	0	2.17	1612/1623	2.17	4.34	4.16	4.27	2.17
B. How ma	ny times	was class cancelle	ed	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1130/1646	4.57	4.76	4.69	4.71	4.57
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overall t	eaching 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 t	he instr	uctor's lectures we	ell prepared	0	0	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	1414/1568	3.71	4.52	4.43	4.54	3.71
		ctor seem intereste		0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1572		4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00
			nd explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	908/1564		4.48	4.28	4.40	4.29
		es contribute to wh		0	0	0	1	1	3	2		1221/1559		4.37	4.29		3.86
			e your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	1	2				4.09	3.98		4.00
		Discussion	1														
l Did cl	ass disc		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
			aged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	1	_	4.20			4.73	4.29		4.20
			and open discussion	2	0	1	0	1	0	3		1071/1368		4.73	4.30	4.58	3.80
		echniques successfu		2	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00			4.36			4.00
		Laboratory	7														
5. Were r	requireme	-	clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.41	****
		Seminar															
5. Were c	riteria :	for grading made cl	ear	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.82	3.68	3.71	****
		Field Work	:														
5. Did co	nference	s help you carry ou	t field activities	4	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.95	3.68	3.95	4.00
			Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
														1			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 5		Red	quir	ea I	or Ma	ajors	j.	0	Graduat	е	1	Majo	ρr	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		<i>a</i>		,				0	TT7		_	37		7
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0		Gei	nera	T				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0								0	0.0.00		1			.1-
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -					lu
			P 0		0.1	1					_	respons	es to b	e sign	ııııcar	1C	
			I 0		Oti	her					5						
			3 0														

Course-Section: EDUC 444 0101 Univ

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					NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean	Sect Mean
			 Genera	 1															
1 Did	l vou gai	n new		_	om this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	372/1649	4 71	4.44	4.28	4.50	4.71
					xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	300/1648	4.71	4.38	4.23	4.36	4.71
					expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	0		****/1375	****	4.54	4.27	4.48	****
		_			xpected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.42	4.20	4.36	5.00
					what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	986/1533	3.83	4.21	4.04	4.14	3.83
	_		-		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 gra	ding s	system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	261/1623	4.71	4.34	4.16	4.27	4.71
	_	_	s class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How	would y	ou gra	de the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	313/1621	4.57	4.18	4.06	4.24	4.57
			Lectur	е															
1. Wer	re the in	struct	or's lecture	s 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	d the ins	tructo	or seem inter	ested i	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	s lecture	mater	rial presente	d and e	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	d the lec	tures	contribute t	o 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	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																		
					what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.51	4.08	4.35	5.00
					ed to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.56	5.00
					nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.58	5.00
4. Wer	re specia	l tech	niques succe	ssful		1	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.36	3.95	4.31	5.00
			Labora	-															
5. Wer	re requir	ements	s for lab rep	orts cl	learly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.41	****
_			Semina	_															
5. Wer	re criter	ia for	grading mad	e cleai	C	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.82	3.68	3.71	****
E Dia			Field			_	0	0	0	0	2	0	4 00	60 / 210	4 00	2 05	2 60	2 05	4 00
5. Dia	i confere	nces n	elp you carr	y out 1	field activities	5	Ü	0	0	U	2	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.95	3.68	3.95	4.00
					Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credit	s Earned	l	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	\$			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4						Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55			1.00-1.99	0	в 0			-									3 -		
56-83	56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0						Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	7
84-15	84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0													3				-	
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0						Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
P 0													respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt		
I 0						Ot1	her					4							
? 0																			

Course-Section: EDUC 446 0101 University of Maryland Page 602 Title Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 LANG, LIT, & INT. DEV Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SCULLY, PAT

Enrollment: 7

Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	5		NR	NA	1	_2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did y	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om 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 t	he instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.38	4.23	4.36	5.00
4. Did o	ther evalu	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.42	4.20	4.36	5.00
5. Did a	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute 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 w	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute 1	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 t	he grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.34	4.16	4.27	5.00
8. How m	nany times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.76	4.69	4.71	4.50
	-			ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	234/1621	4.67	4.18	4.06	4.24	4.67
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	the instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.54	5.00
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1564		4.48	4.28	4.40	5.00
		es contribute to			0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.37	4.29	4.41	5.00
				your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	457/1352	4.33	4.09	3.98	4.07	4.33
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	class discu	ussions contrib	ute 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
				ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.56	5.00
		-	_	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.58	5.00
		echniques succe			0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 948		4.36	3.95	4.31	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	}
														- 				
00-27						Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0							_				_			_			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	Τ				0	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		_									_			_
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0						Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	įh

Other

3

Ι

0

0

responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 451 0101 University of Maryland INTERNSHIP SEM: ECE Instructor: SMALL, SUE ELLE

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 603

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

1/1646 5.00 4.76 4.69 4.71 5.00

Enrollment: 8

Ouestionnaires: 5 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 3 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 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 966/1648 4.20 4.38 4.23 4.36 4.20 0 1 2 4.20 0 0 1 4 4.80 192/1595 4.80 4.42 4.20 4.36 4.80 0 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 2 00 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 00 0 3 2 4.40 522/1512 4.40 4.35 4.10 4.26 4.40 7. Was the grading system clearly explained

O How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 1 3 4.75 220/1623 4.75 4.34 4.16 4.27 4.75 0

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 Ω Ω 0 0 3 5.00 1/1572 5.00 4.85 4.70 4.79 5.00

0 0 0

0 0 0 5 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 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 0 2 0 1 3.67 645/948 3.67 4.36 3.95 4.31 3.67 4. Were special techniques successful 2 0

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 \*\*\*\* 4.63 4.47 4.54 \*\*\*\* 3 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 85

3 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 81 \*\*\*\* 4.47 4.43 4.57 \*\*\*\* 3. Did research projects 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 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 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 3 5.00 1/ 48 5.00 4.22 4.09 4.42 5.00 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 39 \*\*\*\* 4.60 4.47 4.52 \*\*\*\* 2 2 0 0 0 0

3. Was the instructor available for consultation
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 0 1 1 1 4.00 2 0 0 27/ 39 4.00 4.36 4.38 4.59 4.00 2 1 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 68/312 4.00 3.95 3.68 3.95 4.00 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities

#### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Majors Reasons \_\_\_\_\_\_ 00 - 270.00-0.99 Required for Majors 0 Graduate Major 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 В Ω 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C Ω General 0 Under-grad Non-major 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 F 0 Electives 0 Grad. 3.50-4.00 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other

Course-Section: EDUC 453 0101 University of Maryland

Title ELEM INTRNSHP SEMINAR Baltimore County Fall 2008 Instructor: BOURNE, BARBARA

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4

Student Cou	urse Evaluatio	n Questionnaire
-------------	----------------	-----------------

Page 604

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

	Questions							_	ncies	3			tructor		Course	_		Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rar	ık	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1																
l. Did vo:	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1376/1	649	3.75	4.44	4.28	4.50	3.75
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	1	1		1347/1		3.75	4.38	4.23	4.36	3.75
		estions reflec			0	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	950/1		4.00	4.54	4.27	4.48	4.00
	_	ations reflect		1 3	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75			4.75	4.42	4.20	4.36	4.75
				what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	1	1		1366/1		3.25	4.21	4.04	4.14	3.25
	_	_		o what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	1375/1	1512	3.25	4.35	4.10	4.26	3.25
Was the	e gradino	system clearl	y expla:	ined	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1533/1	L623	3.00	4.34	4.16	4.27	3.00
. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1398/1	1646	4.25	4.76	4.69	4.71	4.25
				hing effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	1	0		1345/1		3.50	4.18	4.06	4.24	3.50
		Discus	sion																
. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	795/1	1384	4.00	4.51	4.08	4.35	4.00
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	616/1	1382	4.50	4.73	4.29	4.56	4.50
				d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	426/1	1368	4.75	4.73	4.30	4.58	4.75
. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	•	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	431/	948	4.00	4.36	3.95	4.31	4.00
		Labora	tory																
. Were re	equiremer	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	555	5.00	4.64	4.29	4.41	5.00
		Semina	r																
. Were as	ssigned t	opics relevant	to the	announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	3	1		65/	88	4.25	4.61	4.54	4.66	4.25
. Was the	e instruc	ctor available	for ind	ividual attention	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	78/	85	3.75	4.63	4.47	4.54	3.75
. Did res	search pr	rojects contrib	ute 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
l. Did pre	esentatio	ons 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
. Were cr	riteria f	or grading mad	e clear		0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	173/	288	3.75	3.82	3.68	3.71	3.75
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio:	n										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5				Тур	pe			Majors	3
 00-27	 0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3			 miir	 ed f	or Ma	ior		0	Grad	 luate		0	Majo		 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0		1/6	4urr	cu I	J⊥ 14C	، ٢٠٠١	ی	J	Grac	uact	-	U	Ma JC	) <u>+</u>	J
56-83						Ge:	nera	1				0	Unde	ייט–מי	rad	4	Non-	-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D 0		00.	ııcıa	_				J	onae	91	Laa	-	14011	a J O I	I
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		E1	ecti	ves				1	####	± _ 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	αh
craa.	J	3.30 1.00	-	P 0								-			es to b			_	
-				- 0								_	1001	- 0110	CO L	. Digi	a		
				I 0		()+	her					3							

Course-Section: EDUC 471 0101 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF TRAINING AND D Baltimore County

Instructor: MCSHANE, RYAN

Enrollment: 13 Ouestionnaires: 10

# Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 605

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 0 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 4.307. 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  $0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 3 \quad 7 \quad 4.70 \ 1004/1646 \quad 4.70 \quad 4.76 \quad 4.69 \quad 4.71 \quad 4.70$ 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 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 1 1 4 4.50 203/948 4.50 4.36 3.95 4.31 4.50

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	С	0	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	9	_	_		
				?	1						

HUMAN LEARNING/COGNITI

Title

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	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect 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		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		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		1240/1512		4.35	4.10	4.35	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	5	3	4	7		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		1509/1646		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		1385/1568	3.81		4.43	4.52	3.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	6	14		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		1399/1564	3.48	4.48	4.28	4.41	3.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2 4	0 1	4 4	2	4 2	9	2		1460/1559	3.14		4.29		3.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	Τ	4	3	2	4	5	3.1/	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		1034/1384		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		****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.27	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 243	****	5.00	4.12	4.61	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 212	****	5.00 ***	4.40	4.73	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22 20	0	0	0	0 1	1	0 1		****/ 209 ****/ 555	****		4.35 4.29	4.80	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	U	U	U	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 555		4.64	4.29	4.66	
Seminar	0.1	•	_			_								****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21 21	0	1 1	0	0 1	1 0	0		****/ 88	****	4.61	4.54	4.63	****
<ol> <li>Was the instructor available for individual attention</li> <li>Did research projects contribute to what you learned</li> </ol>	21	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 85 ****/ 81	****	4.63 4.47	4.47 4.43	4.50 4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 92	****	4.53	4.43	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	1	0	0	6	0		185/ 288			3.68	3.87	3.57
5. Note differia for grading made diedi	10	Ü	-	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	3.37	103/ 200	3.37	3.02	3.00	3.07	3.37
Field Work	17	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	41 / 50	2 22	1 (1	4.06	<i>1</i> F1	2 22
<ol> <li>Did field experience contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria</li> </ol>	17 17	0	2	0	2 0	2 4	1	3.33	41/ 52 41/ 48	3.33	4.64 4.22	4.06	4.51	3.33
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	1	1	0	3	0		****/ 39	****	4.22	4.09	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		3.17
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	2	3	0	7	0	3.00	256/ 312		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		****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.92	****
1 Suddies France For all one Statemen		-	ŭ	ŭ	ŭ	_	٠	1.00	, 110			2.22	3.72	

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

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	3	 А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	11	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	17	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: EDUC 602T 8010 University of Maryla Title Baltimore County Instructor: HODELL, CHARLES Fall 2008

Enrollment:

12

University of Maryland Page 607
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	11	Student (	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------------	----	-----------	--------	------------	---------------

I

0

0

		0		), TD	377		equer		5	-		ructor		se Dep		Level	Sect	
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Меа	n Mea	n Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera																
1. Did vo	u gain ne	w insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	186/164	9 4.9	1 4.4	4 4.28	4.46	4.91
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	148/164					4.91
		estions reflect			0	8	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	401/137					4.67
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	352/159			2 4.20	4.35	4.64
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/153		0 4.2	1 4.04	4.28	5.00
	_	-		to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	217/151	2 4.7	3 4.3	5 4.10	4.35	4.73
		system clearly			0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	251/162	3 4.7	3 4.3	4 4.16	4.29	4.73
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/164	6 5.0	0 4.7	6 4.69	4.81	5.00
	-			ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	101/162				4.20	4.89
				3														
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/156	8 5.0	0 4.5	2 4.43	4.52	5.00
2. Did th	e instruct	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/157	2 5.0	0 4.8	5 4.70	4.83	5.00
3. Was le	cture mate	erial presented	d and e	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	169/156	4.9	1 4.4	8 4.28	4.41	4.91
4. Did th	e lecture	s contribute to	what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	205/155	9 4.9	1 4.3	7 4.29	4.41	4.91
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enl	our understanding	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	501/135	2 4.2	7 4.0	9 3.98	4.10	4.27	
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ite to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	150/138	4 4.9	0 4.5	1 4.08	4.30	4.90
2. Were a	ll student	ts actively end	courage	ed to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	243/138	2 4.9	0 4.7	3 4.29	4.52	4.90
3. Did th	e instruct	tor encourage :	fair ar	nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/136	8 5.0	0 4.7	3 4.30	4.56	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful		1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	104/ 94	8 4.8	0 4.3	6 3.95	4.03	4.80
		Field N	Vork															
3. Was th	e instruct	tor available :	for cor	nsultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	9 ***	* 4.6	0 4.47	4.58	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	1									
Credits E	arnod	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Pos	sons				-	уре:			Majors	•	
crearcs E	arneu 		Expected Grades						, 									
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	3	A 10		Rec	uire	ed fo	or Ma	ijor	s	0	Gradua	ite	6	Maj	or	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0						,		-			-			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-	grad	5	Non	-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0										_			-	
Grad.	6	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### -	Means	there	are no	t enoug	<sub>j</sub> h		
		3.50-4.00		P 0												gnifica	_	-
				T 0		0+1						^	-			-		

Other

9

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

THE ADULT LEARNER RAUDENBUSH, LIN Fall 2008 Enrollment: 8

Questionnaires: 7

Course-Section: EDUC 605 8010 Page 608 Title FEB 11, 2009 Instructor: Job IRBR3029

				Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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
	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
	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
	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
	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
	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
	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
	Freq	uency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Cr	edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	

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

#### Course-Section: EDUC 607 0101 University of Maryland Page 609 Title Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 PROCESSES & ACQ READIN Job IRBR3029

Instructor: YOUNG, PATRICIA Fall 2008

Ρ

I

0

0

Enrollment: 4

Questionnaires: 4 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Fre	equer	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 54		Genera	_	+b-i	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4 00	1102/1640	4 00	1 11	4 20	1 10	4 00
	1 0	ew insights, ski			0	-	•	•	Ţ		Ţ		1183/1649		4.44	4.28	4.46	4.00
		ctor make clear		_	0	0	0	1	2	1	0		1591/1648		4.38	4.23	4.34	3.00
		uestions reflect			0	1	0	0	2	1	0		1259/1375		4.54	4.27	4.44	3.33
		uations reflect		_	0	0	2	0	0	Τ	Τ		1570/1595		4.42	4.20	4.35	2.75
	_	-		what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	. ,		4.21	4.04	4.28	4.25
		_		to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	0		1428/1512		4.35	4.10	4.35	3.00
		g system clearly	_	ained	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	,		4.34	4.16	4.29	4.50
	-	was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	1	3		913/1646		4.76	4.69	4.81	4.75
9. How	w would you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1504/1621	3.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	3.00
		Lecture	=															
1. Wer	re the instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	1547/1568	2.75	4.52	4.43	4.52	2.75
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	1	1	1		1463/1572		4.85	4.70	4.83	4.00
				explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	0	0		1552/1564		4.48	4.28	4.41	2.33
		es contribute to			1	0	2	1	0	0	0		1556/1559		4.37	4.29		1.33
				your understanding	1	0	1	1	1	0	0		1335/1352		4.09	3.98		2.00
J. 210	a additivibud	1 000111114400 0111		, our undersounding	_	Ū	_	_	_	Ü	Ū	2.00	1333, 1331	2.00	1.05	3.70	1.10	2.00
		Discus																
				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. Wer	re all stude	nts actively end	courage	ed 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	d the instru	ctor encourage :	fair ar	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	844/1368	4.25	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.25
4. Wer	re special to	echniques succe	ssful		0	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	901/ 948	2.67	4.36	3.95	4.03	2.67
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
	_ ,						_					_						
Credit	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	5			Ту:	pe 			Majors	; 
00-27	7 0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	;	0	Graduat	е	2	Majo	or	0
28-55	5 0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	3 0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	4
84-15	50 0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	. 2	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t			enoug	<sub>J</sub> h

Other

responses to be significant

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2008

Page 610 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Instr	uctor	Course
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean

Course-Section: EDUC 608 0101

5

INSTRUCT READING

SHELTON, NANCY

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 4

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	-	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.44	1 20	1 16	E 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	4.28	4.46 4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.54	4.23		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
Frequ	ency	Diet	rih	ıtioı	า									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: EDUC 615 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County MATERIALS TEACH READ

Title FEB 11, 2009 Instructor: YOUNG, PATRICIA (Instr. A) Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 611

Enrollment:	2				
Questionnaires:	2	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions								Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did sassigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did sassigned readings contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 8. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Did written instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques successful 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6. D.			Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did sassigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did sassigned readings contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 8. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Did written instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques successful 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6. D.			Genera	 1															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 556/1648 4.50 4.38 4.23 4.34 4.50 4.00 4.00 4.00 1.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0	1. Did s	vou gain n		_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.44	4.28	4.46	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 0 2 0 4.00 1067/1395 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 4.50 380/1512 4.50 4.25 4.10 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 4.25 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1623 5.00 4.34 4.16 4.29 5.00 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1623 5.00 4.34 4.16 4.29 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1568 5.00 4.35 4.10 4.25 5.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.0							-	-	-	-	1			. ,					
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 4.00 1067/1595 4.00 4.42 4.20 4.35 4.05 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 0 1 1 4.50 366/1533 4.50 4.21 4.04 4.28 4.50 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 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 0 2 5.00 1/1623 5.00 4.34 4.16 4.29 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 374/1621 4.25 4.18 4.06 4.29 4.25 4.25 4.26 4.29 4.20 4.25 4.20 4.20 4.25 4.20 4.25 4.20 4.25 4.20 4.25 4.20 4.20 4.25 4.20 4.20 4.25 4.20 4.20 4.25 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20						-	-	-	-	-	1	_		,					
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 1 1 4.50 380/1512 4.50 4.34 4.16 4.29 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 374/1624 4.00 4.76 4.69 4.81 4.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 374/1624 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 0 2 5.00 1/1576 5.00 4.85 4.70 4.83 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1576 5.00 4.85 4.70 4.83 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 651/1564 4.50 4.48 4.28 4.41 4.50 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00						0	0	0	0	0	2	0		,					
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 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 9. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 374/1621 4.25 4.18 4.06 4.20 4.25    Lecture  Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1568 5.00 4.52 4.43 4.52 5.00 2.01 dthe instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 611/1572 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 4.50 615/1559 4.50 4.37 4.80 4.41 4.50 5.00 4.37 4.29 4.41 4.50 5.00 4.00 611/1572 5.00 4.85 4.70 4.83 5.00 611/1572 5.00 4.85 4.70 4.83 5.00 611/1572 5.00 4.85 4.70 4.83 5.00 611/1572 5.00 4.85 4.70 4.83 5.00 611/1572 5.00 4.85 4.70 4.83 5.00 611/1572 5.00 4.85 4.70 4.83 5.00 611/1572 6.00 4.85 4.70 4.83 5.00 611/1572 6.00 4.85 4.70 4.83 5.00 611/1572 6.00 4.85 4.70 4.83 5.00 611/1572 6.00 4.85 4.70 4.83 5.00 611/1572 6.00 4.85 4.70 4.83 5.00 611/1572 6.00 4.85 4.70 4.83 5.00 611/1572 6.00 4.85 4.70 4.83 5.00 611/1572 6.00 4.85 4.70 4.83 5.00 611/1572 6.00 4.85 4.70 4.83 5.00 611/1572 6.00 4.85 4.70 4.83 5.00 611/1572 6.00 4.85 4.70 4.83 5.00 611/1572 6.00 4.85 4.70 4.83 5.00 611/1572 6.00 4.85 4.70 4.83 5.00 611/1572 6.00 4.85 4.70 4.83 5.00 611/1572 6.00 4.85 4.70 4.83 6.00 611/1572 6.00 4.85 4.70 4.83 6.00 611/1572 6.00 4.85 4.70 4.83 6.00 611/1572 6.00 4.85 4.70 4.83 6.00 611/1572 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.0						0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 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 0 0 2 0 4.00 1544/1646 4.00 4.76 4.69 4.81 4.06 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 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 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 0 2 5.00 1/1572 5.00 4.85 4.70 4.83 5.00 4.36 4.20 4.25 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 651/1564 4.50 4.88 4.41 4.50 4.06 4.08 4.08 4.28 4.41 4.50 4.06 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00		_	-		_	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50					4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 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 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 4.65 4.70 4.83 5.00 3.00 3.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4						0	0	0	0		0	2	5.00			4.34	4.16	4.29	5.00
2. 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		_	J 1			0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.76	4.69	4.81	4.00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 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 4.00 1/1572 5.00 4.00 4.00 1/1572 5.00 4.00 4.00 1/1572 5.00 4.00 4.00 1/1572 5.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 1/1572 5.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 1/1572 5.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 1/1572 5.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 1/1572 5.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00		-			hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	374/1621		4.18	4.06	4.20	4.25
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 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 4.00 1/1572 5.00 4.00 4.00 1/1572 5.00 4.00 4.00 1/1572 5.00 4.00 4.00 1/1572 5.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 1/1572 5.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 1/1572 5.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 1/1572 5.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 1/1572 5.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00			<b>-</b> .																
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 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 4.00 dthe lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 655/1559 4.50 4.37 4.29 4.41 4.50 5.00 dudiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 1049/1352 3.50 4.09 3.98 4.10 3.50 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 1049/1352 3.50 4.09 3.98 4.10 3.50 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 3.50 1049/1352 3.50 4.09 3.98 4.10 3.50 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 437/1384 4.50 4.51 4.08 4.30 4.50 2.00 0.00 0.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1 Womo	the insta			nwanawad	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	E 00	1 /1 5 6 0	E 00	4 52	1 12	4 E2	E 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 4.50 dt 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  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 4.50 616/1382 4.50 4.73 4.29 4.52 4.50 4. Were special techniques successful 0 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 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0						-			-	-	-			,					
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				-	-	-													
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 4.29 4.52 4.50  4. Were special techniques successful 0 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 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0												,							
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 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  I 0 Other 2					-	-						,							
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 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 Graduate 2 Selectives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 2	o. Dia a	audiovisua	i teciniques en	nance y	our understanding	U	U	U	U		1	U	3.50	1049/1352	3.50	4.09	3.90	4.10	3.50
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 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			Discus	sion															
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 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 I 0 Other 2	1. Did 0	class disc	ussions contrib	ute 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
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  1 0 Other 2	2. Were	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.50
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 P 0 responses to be significant	3. Did t	the instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.50
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons         Type         Majors           00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 Required for Majors 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1         Required for Majors 0 Graduate 2 Major 2         28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1         Under-grad 0 Non-major 0         0 Non-major 0           56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 0 Non-major 0         0 H### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant         0 H### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	4. Were	special t	echniques succe	ssful		0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.00
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons         Type         Majors           00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 Required for Majors 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1         Required for Majors 0 Graduate 2 Major 2         28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1         Under-grad 0 Non-major 0         0 Non-major 0           56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 0 Non-major 0         0 H### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant         0 H### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					Frem	encs	, Diet	trib	ıti oı	<b>1</b>									
00-27					11040	cricy	DIS	CIID	46101	.1									
28-55	Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	;
28-55	00-27	0	A 1		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	2	Majo	or	2		
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 P 0 I 0 Other 2	28-55	0		0	в 1			-			_						3 -		
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0  Grad. 2 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 I 0 Other 2	56-83	0			C 0		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-q	rad	0	Non-	major	0
Grad. 2 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 2		0												J				-	
P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 2					F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ıh
I 0 Other 2					P 0													_	
					I O		Otl	her					2	-		3			

# Course-Section: EDUC 615 0101 University of Maryland Page 612 Title MATERIALS TEACH READ Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 2

Questionnaires: 2

Fall 2008
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sid	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-	-		
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: EDUC 621 0101

INST STRAT/INTEG ECE C

Title Instructor: BELL, DEBORAH A

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 8

4

Grad.

3.50-4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Page 613 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Questions						equei 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General															
1 Did vou	ı dəin ne		.ls from this course	0	0	0	0	Ο	1	7	4.88	212/1649	4.88	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.88
			the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	263/1648		4.38	4.23	4.34	4.75
			the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	401/1375		4.54	4.27	4.44	4.67
	_		the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	608/1595		4.42	4.20	4.35	4.43
			ite to what you learned	0	1	2	0	0	1	4		1103/1533		4.21	4.04	4.28	3.71
			bute to what you learned	0 E	1	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	225/1512		4.35	4.10	4.35	4.71
		system clearly		0	0	0	1	0	0	7		370/1623	4.63	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.63
	How many times was class cancelled			0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1646		4.76	4.69	4.81	5.00
	. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness				0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	313/1621		4.18	4.06	4.20	4.57
		Lecture															
		ctor's lectures		0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	480/1568		4.52	4.43	4.52	4.75
			sted in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1572		4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00
		-	l and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	5		524/1564		4.48	4.28	4.41	4.63
			what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2		4.50	695/1559		4.37	4.29	4.41	4.50
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enh	nance your understanding	1	3	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1277/1352	2.75	4.09	3.98	4.10	2.75
		Discuss															
			ite to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1384		4.51	4.08	4.30	5.00
			ouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1382		4.73	4.29	4.52	5.00
			air and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	316/1368		4.73	4.30	4.56	4.86
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	179/ 948	4.57	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.57
		Laborat	1														
5. Were re	equiremer	its for lab repo	orts clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.66	****
_		Seminar		_					_								
5. Were cr	riteria f	or grading made	e clear	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.82	3.68	3.87	****
		Field W	Jork														
5. Did con	nferences	s 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
			Free	quency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Re:	ason	S			Ту	ne			Majors	<b>.</b>
				- 					- 								
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 7		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	4	Majo	or	0
28-55																	
56-83					Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	-major	8
84-150																	

Electives

Other

0

7

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

0

0

0

Ρ

I

Course-Section: EDUC 622 0101 University of Maryland Page 614 Title Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 INSTRUC STRGY ELEM MAT Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: ALBRIGHT, DEBOR

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 6

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions			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	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

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

#### Course-Section: EDUC 623 0101 University of Maryland Page 615 Title Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 INSTRUC STRTGY TEACH S Job IRBR3029

Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 6

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	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	****

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

Course-Section: EDUC 625 0101 Title

University of Maryland TEACH READ WRIT ESL I Baltimore County

SHIN, SARAH Instructor:

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 11

Fall 2008

Page 616 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

						Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 L															
l. Did you	gain ne	ew insights,skil	lls 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	instruc	ctor make clear	the expe	ected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	401/1648	4.64	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.64
		uestions reflect			0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	704/1375	4.36	4.54	4.27	4.44	4.36
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	263/1595	4.73	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.73
	_	eadings contribu		_	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	421/1533	4.45	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.45
		_		what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	564/1512	4.36	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.36
		g system clearly	_	ned	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	251/1623	4.73	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.73
	-	was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	11		1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.81	
. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overal	ll teach:	ing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	313/1621	4.57	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.57
		Lecture	9															
. Were th	e instru	actor's lectures	s well p	repared	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	535/1568	4.73	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.73
		ctor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82		4.82	4.85	4.70	4.83	4.82
		erial presented			0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	, -	4.82	4.48	4.28	4.41	
		es contribute to			0	0	0	0	1	2			549/1559			4.29	4.41	
				ır understanding	1	0	0	0	1	5		4.30	482/1352	4.30			4.10	
		5.																
		Discuss			^	^	0	1	1	0	7	1 26	E00/1204	1 26	4 51	4 00	4 20	4 20
		ussions contribu		-	0	0	0	1	1	2		4.36	582/1384	4.36		4.08	4.30	4.36
		nts actively end			0	0	0	•	1	3		4.55	585/1382	4.55	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.55
				open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3 4		4.73	461/1368	4.73	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.73
. were sp	ecial te	echniques succes	SSIUI		0	U	U	U	1	4	6	4.45	242/ 948	4.45	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.45
		Laborat	cory															
6. Were re	equiremer	nts for lab repo	orts clea	arly specified	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.66	****
		Field W	Jork															
. Did con	ferences	s help you carry	out fie	eld activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	3.95	3.68	3.83	***
				Frequ	ency.	Dis	trib	ıtior	n									
		G GDA		Down and all Considers				D					m				20-4	
Credits Ea	ırnea 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe 			Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	S	0	Graduat	е	4	Majo	or	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	L				1	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	1
84-150	0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0																	
Grad.				Ele	ecti	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - I					ſh		
P 0										response	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt				
I 0			Ot1	ner					9									
				? 1														

Course-Section: EDUC 627 0101 University of Maryland Title INS STRAT FL SEC SCH

Baltimore County Fall 2008

OSKOZ, ANA Instructor: 5

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 4

F	age	617
FEB	11,	2009
Job	IRBF	3029

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

		Fre	eque	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	328/1649	4.75	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.75
0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	263/1648	4.75	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.75
1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.54	4.27	4.44	5.00
0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	236/1595	4.75	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.75
0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.21	4.04	4.28	5.00
d 0	0	-	0	0	1	3	4.75	194/1512	4.75	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.75
0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.50
0	0	-	-	0	0	4			5.00	4.76	4.69	4.81	5.00
s 2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	5.00
0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.52	5.00
0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	931/1572	4.75	4.85	4.70	4.83	4.75
0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.48	4.28	4.41	5.00
1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.37	4.29	4.41	5.00
0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.09	3.98	4.10	4.00
0	0	0	0	0	Ο	4	5 00	1/1384	5 00	4 51	4 08	4 30	5.00
			-					,					5.00
								,					5.00
1	0		0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.36			
3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	266/ 288	2.00	3.82	3.68	3.87	2.00
quency	/ Dis	stribu	utio	n									
s			Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
	 R <i>e</i>	eauire		or Ma	ior		0	Graduat	 _	2	Maio	 r	0
		o que e			.,		Ü	OI addado	_	_		_	Ü
	Ge	enera:	L				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	4
	Ge	enera:	L				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	4
		eneral lectiv	=				0	Under-g:				3	_
			=				-		Means t	here a	re not	enoug	_
	E]		=				-	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	_
	0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 3	0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	NR NA 1  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0	NR NA 1 2  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	NR NA 1 2 3  0 0 0 0 0 0 0  1 1 0 0 0 0 0  1 1 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 0 0	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5  0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 0 0 0 0	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean  0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 5.00  8 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 2 4.00  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00  quency Distribution  Reasons	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank  0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 328/1649 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 263/1648 1 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1375 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 236/1595 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 236/1595 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 194/1512 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 194/1512 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 502/1623 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 502/1623 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1646 s 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1664 s 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1664 s 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1564 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1564 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1559 0 0 0 1 0 1 2 4.00 690/1352  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1384 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1384 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1382 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1384 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1384 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1384 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1384 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1382 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1368 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1368 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2.00 266/ 288  quency Distribution  s Reasons Type	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean  0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 328/1649 4.75 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 263/1648 4.75 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1375 5.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 236/1595 4.75 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 236/1595 4.75 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 194/1512 4.75 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 194/1512 4.75 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 502/1623 4.50 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1646 5.00 s 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1646 5.00 s 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1646 5.00 s 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1646 5.00 c 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1568 5.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1564 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1564 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1559 5.00 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 2 4.00 690/1352 4.00  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1384 5.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1388 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1388 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1368 5.00 3 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 266/ 288 2.00  quency Distribution  s Reasons Type	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean  0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 328/1649 4.75 4.44 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 263/1648 4.75 4.38 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 236/1595 4.75 4.42 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 236/1595 4.75 4.42 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 194/1512 4.75 4.35 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 194/1512 4.75 4.35 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 502/1623 4.50 4.35 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1621 5.00 4.76 s 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1621 5.00 4.18  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1568 5.00 4.52 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1564 5.00 4.34 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1564 5.00 4.38 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1564 5.00 4.37 0 0 0 1 0 1 2 4.00 690/1352 4.00 4.09  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.73 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.73 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1368 5.00 4.73 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1368 5.00 4.73 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1368 5.00 4.73 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1368 5.00 4.73 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1368 5.00 4.73 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1368 5.00 4.73 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1368 5.00 4.73 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1368 5.00 4.73 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2.00 266/288 2.00 3.82  quency Distribution  s Reasons Type	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean  0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 328/1649 4.75 4.44 4.28 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 263/1648 4.75 4.38 4.23 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 236/1595 4.75 4.42 4.20 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 236/1595 4.75 4.42 4.20 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 194/1512 4.75 4.35 4.10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 502/1623 4.50 4.34 4.16 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1568 5.00 4.76 4.69 s 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1646 5.00 4.76 4.69 s 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 931/1572 4.75 4.85 4.70 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 931/1572 4.75 4.85 4.70 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 5.00 1/1568 5.00 4.34 4.06  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1568 5.00 4.48 4.28 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.37 4.29 0 0 0 1 0 1 2 4.00 690/1352 4.00 4.09 3.98  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1384 5.00 4.51 4.08 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1388 5.00 4.73 4.29 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1368 5.00 4.73 4.29 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1368 5.00 4.73 4.29 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1368 5.00 4.73 4.29 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1368 5.00 4.73 4.29 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1368 5.00 4.73 4.29 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1368 5.00 4.73 4.39 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1368 5.00 4.73 4.39 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2.00 266/ 288 2.00 3.82 3.68  quency Distribution  s Reasons Type	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean  0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 328/1649 4.75 4.44 4.28 4.46 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 263/1648 4.75 4.38 4.23 4.34 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 236/1595 4.75 4.42 4.20 4.35 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 236/1595 4.75 4.42 4.20 4.35 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 194/1512 4.75 4.35 4.10 4.35 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 194/1512 4.75 4.35 4.10 4.35 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 502/1623 4.50 4.34 4.16 4.29 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1636 5.00 4.76 4.69 4.81 s 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1621 5.00 4.18 4.06 4.20  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 931/1572 4.75 4.85 4.70 4.83 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 931/1572 4.75 4.85 4.70 4.83 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1564 5.00 4.48 4.28 4.41 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 2 4.00 690/1352 4.00 4.09 3.98 4.10  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1384 5.00 4.51 4.08 4.30 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.73 4.29 4.51 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.73 4.29 4.51 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.73 4.29 4.51 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.73 4.29 4.52 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.73 4.29 4.52 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.73 4.29 4.52 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.73 4.29 4.52 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.73 4.29 4.55 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.73 4.29 4.55 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.73 4.29 4.55 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.73 4.30 4.56 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.73 4.30 4.56 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.73 4.30 4.56 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.73 4.30 4.56 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.73 4.30 4.56 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.73 4.30 4.56 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.73 4.30 4.56 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.73 4.30 4.56 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.73 4.30 4.56 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.73 4.30 4.56 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.73 4.30 4.56 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

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

University of Maryland Page 618 FEB 11, 2009 Baltimore County Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	3	
Questionnaires:	2	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions				NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1498/1649	3.50	4.44	4.28	4.46	3.50
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	1	0		1481/1648		4.38	4.23		3.50
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	1	0		1208/1375		4.54	4.27		3.50
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	1	0		1397/1595		4.42	4.20	4.35	3.50
				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 wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	o what you learned	. 0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1266/1512	3.50	4.35	4.10	4.35	3.50
		g system clearl			0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.00
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1345/1621	3.50	4.18	4.06	4.20	3.50
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	uctor's lecture	s well j	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.50
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested in	n 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 le	cture mat	terial presente	d and ex	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.48	4.28	4.41	4.50
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o 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 au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1352	4.50	4.09	3.98	4.10	4.50
		Discus																
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1384				4.30	5.00
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1382		4.73	4.29	4.52	5.00
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1368		4.73	4.30	4.56	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.36	3.95	4.03	5.00
		Semina	=															
5. Were c	riteria 1	for grading mad	e clear		0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.82	3.68	3.87	4.00
				Freq	uency	y Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Re	 guir	ed f	or Ma	ijors	 3	0	 Graduat	 e	1	Majo	 r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			-			_						3 -		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0													-	
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot:	her					2	_		_			
				? 0														

Course-Section: EDUC 632 0101 University of Maryland FEB 11, 2009 Title INST STRAT: TCHG SEC EN Baltimore County Job IRBR3029

Fall 2008 Instructor: NORTH-COLEMAN,

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 7

Student	Course	Evaluat	ion	Question	ınaire
---------	--------	---------	-----	----------	--------

Page 619

								Fre	eque	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	;			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																	
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil	ls fro	m this cours	se	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1311/1649	3.86	4.44	4.28	4.46	3.86
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1375/1648	3.71	4.38	4.23	4.34	3.71
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	3	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.50
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you lea	rned	0	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1103/1533	3.71	4.21	4.04	4.28	3.71
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contri	.bute t	o what you l	earned	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	799/1512	4.14	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.14
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearly	, expla	ined		0	0	0	1	4	2	0	3.14	1512/1623	3.14	4.34	4.16	4.29	3.14
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled			0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overal	.l teac	hing effecti	veness	3	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1192/1621	3.75	4.18	4.06	4.20	3.75
		Lecture	<u> </u>																
1. Were t	he instr	uctor'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 th	ne instru	ctor seem intere	ested i	n the subjec	et	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	1071/1572	4.67	4.85	4.70	4.83	4.67
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presented	l and e	explained cle	early	1	0	0	2	0	2	2	3.67	1336/1564	3.67	4.48	4.28	4.41	3.67
4. Did th	ne lecture	es 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 au	diovisua	l techniques enh	ıance y	our understa	anding	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	457/1352	4.33	4.09	3.98	4.10	4.33
		Discuss	sion																
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribu	ite to	what you lea	rned	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	673/1384	4.25	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.25
		nts actively end				3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.52	5.00
		ctor encourage f				3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.56	5.00
		echniques succes		-		3	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	601/ 948	3.75	4.36	3.95	4.03	3.75
					Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
O	1	G GDA		The same of the sale of the sa	C				Da		_			m				M =	
Credits E	.arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades				ке:	asons				Ту:	ре 			Majors	; 
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	А	5		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajor	S	0	Graduat	е	4	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1														

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 636 0101 Univ

Title ESL/FOR LANG TEST & EV

Instructor: NELSON, JOHN E.

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 620
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

	Questions					equei 2	ncies 3		5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		_		Level Mean	
	General															
1 Did you gain no	ew insights,skills from this	g courge	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4 94	112/1649	4 94	4.44	4 28	4.46	4.94
	ctor make clear the expected		0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82		4.82	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.82
	uestions reflect the expect	-	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81			4.54		4.44	4.81
_	uations reflect the expected	_	0	0	0	0	1	0		4.88	144/1595		4.42	4.20	4.35	4.88
	eadings contribute to what	-	0	0	0	0	0	3			142/1533		4.21	4.04	4.28	4.82
_	signments contribute to what	-	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	146/1512	4.82	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.82
	g 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 instru	uctor's lectures well prepa:	red	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.52	5.00
	ctor seem interested in the	-	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1572			4.70	4.83	5.00
		_	2	0	0	0	0			4.87	,			4.28	4.41	
	lecture material presented and explained of the lectures contribute to what you learne		2	0	0	0	0	1		4.93	-,		4.37		4.41	
5. Did audiovisua	d audiovisual techniques enhance your understand			3	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	129/1352	4.82	4.09	3.98	4.10	4.82
	Discussion															
	ussions contribute to what y	-	3	0	0	0	1		10		343/1384			4.08	4.30	4.64
	nts actively encouraged to p	-	3	0	0	0	0				194/1382		4.73	4.29	4.52	4.93
	ctor encourage fair and open	n discussion	3	0	0	0	0				392/1368		4.73	4.30	4.56	
4. Were special to	echniques successful		3	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	137/ 948	4.71	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.71
	Laboratory	161.3			•				_							
5. Were requirement	nts for lab reports clearly	specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.66	****
F. Maria multipular	Seminar		1.0	0	0	-1	0	^	^	0 00	**** / 200		2 00	2 60	2 07	
5. Were criteria	for grading made clear		16	0	0	1	0	0	U	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.82	3.68	3.87	****
5 Did	Field Work		1.0	0	0	0	0	1	^	4 00	**** / 210		2 05	2 60	2 02	
5. Did conferences	s help you carry out field a	activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	U	4.00	****/ 312	* * * *	3.95	3.68	3.83	
		Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Exp	pected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 3	0.00-0.99 1	A 13		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor		0	Graduat	 e 1	.1	Majo	 or	16
28-55 0	1.00-1.99 0	в 1			-			_						J -		
56-83 0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				4	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	major	1
84-150 0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0													-	
Grad. 11	3.50-4.00 9	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	ſh
		P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
		I 0		O+1	her				1	.2						
		2 0		OCI	ICI					. 4						

Course-Section: EDUC 642 0101 University of Maryland Page 621 Title ECE MATH/SCI PROCESSES Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009

Instructor: RIVKIN, MARY

Enrollment: 7

Questionnaires: 7

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

				Exc	omior	ncies			Tnat	ructor	Course	Dont	UMBC	Torrol	Sect
Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General			_		_	_									
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this cour		0	0	0	1	1	1	4		1076/1649	4.14	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goal		0	0	0	2	2	0	3		1457/1648	3.57	4.38	4.23	4.34	3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goal		0	0	0	0	3	1	3		1067/1595	4.00	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you le		0	0	2	0	0	1	4		1103/1533		4.21	4.04	4.28	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you	learned	0	1	0	1	2	0	3		1068/1512		4.35	4.10	4.35	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		0	0	2	2	1	2	0		1603/1623		4.34	4.16	4.29	2.43
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71			4.76	4.69		
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effect	iveness	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 subje	ect	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 cl		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 underst		2	0	0	0	0	3	2		399/1352		4.09	3.98		4.40
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you le		0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.86	911/1384	2 06	4.51	4.08	4.30	3.86
·		0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71			4.73	4.08	4.52	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to partic	_	-	0	1	0	0	0	5 6	4.71	732/1368		4.73	4.29	4.52	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open disc	cussion	0	1	0	0		0			- ,					4.43
4. Were special techniques successful		0	1	U	U	2	2	2	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.00
	Freque	ency	Dist	ribu	ation	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected	d Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	<b>;</b>
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A	6		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors		0	Graduat	е	5	Majo	r	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B	0														
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C	0		Ger	neral	_				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	7

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

Course-Section: EDUC 644 0101

LING/ESOL EDUCATORS

Title Instructor: SHIN, SARAH

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 9

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 622 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

	Questions					NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 L															
1. Did you	u gain new	v insights,skil	lls 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	e instruct	or make clear	the exp	ected 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	e exam que	estions reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	505/1375	4.56	4.54	4.27	4.44	4.56
4. Did oth	ner evalua	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	818/1595	4.25	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.25
				hat you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	241/1533	4.67	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.67
				what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	225/1512	4.71	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.71
		system clearly		_	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	130/1623	4.89		4.16	4.29	4.89
		vas class cance	_		0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1646	5.00			4.81	
				ning effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	313/1621					
		Lecture	<u> </u>															
1 Were th	ne instruc	ctor's lectures		repared	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	480/1568	4.75	4.52	4.43	4.52	4 75
					0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1572	5.00			4.83	
	the instructor seem interested in the subject lecture material presented and explained clot the lectures contribute to what you learned				0	0	0	0	0	2		4.78		4.78			4.41	
	the lectures contribute to what you learned				0	0	0	0	0	2			361/1559				4.41	
	the lectures contribute to what you learned audiovisual techniques enhance your understa				0	0	1	0	0	5		4.00	690/1352				4.10	
J. Dia au	Discussion				O	O	_	O	O	5	,	1.00	000/1332	1.00	1.05	3.70	1.10	1.00
ו הלה ו						0	0	0	0	2	7	4 70	220/1204	4 70	<i>1</i> F1	4 00	4 20	4 70
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learn Were all students actively encouraged to participa				0	0	0	0	0	2 1		4.78			4.51		4.30	4.78
					0	0	0	0	0	1		4.89		4.89			4.52	
				l open discussion	0	1	0	0	2	3		4.89	285/1368	4.89			4.56	
4. were sp	pecial teo	chniques succes	SSIUI		U	1	U	U	2	3	3	4.13	399/ 948	4.13	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.13
		Laborat	-															
5. Were re	equirement	s for lab repo	orts cle	early specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.66	****
		Semina																
5. Were c	riteria fo	or grading made	e clear		7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	***	3.82	3.68	3.87	****
		Field V	Vork															
5. Did con	nferences	help you carry	out fi	eld activities	5	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.95	3.68	3.83	4.00
		Self I	Paced															
5. Were th	nere enoug	gh proctors for	all th	ne students	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	***	****	3.99	3.92	***
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtion	1									
a 1'. =	,	g gp.						_					_					
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Ту <u>г</u> 	e 			Majors	
00-27						Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduate	9	6	Majo	or	9
28-55							_								•			-
56-83						Ger	neral	-				1	Under-gr	rad	3	Non-	major	0
	84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0														_			
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - N				_	h
				P 0		0.1						_	response	es to k	e sign	uiicar	ıt	
				3 0 I 0		Otł	ıer					6						
				? 0														

Course-Section: EDUC 650 0101 U
Title EDUC IN CULTURAL PERSP

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Instructor: SMITH JR, MURDU

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 623 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Ouestions		NTO	<b>NT</b> 70	Fro	_	ncies 3	5	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept		Level	Sect
		Questions			NA				- <del>1</del>		меан	Ralik	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skills fr	om 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 th	he instruc	ctor make clear the e	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 th	he exam qu	estions 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 of	ther evalu	ations reflect the $\epsilon$	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 as	ssigned re	eadings 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 w	ritten ass	signments 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 th	he grading	g system clearly expl	ained -	2	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	480/1623	4.53	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.53
8. How ma	any 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 wo	ould you g	grade the overall tea	ching 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 t	the instru	prepared	6	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	715/1568	4.62	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.62	
2. Did th	ecture material presented and explained cl		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 le	the instructor seem interested in the subjected enterial presented and explained cle		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 th				6	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	272/1559	4.85	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.85
5. Did a	d the lectures contribute to what you learned d audiovisual techniques enhance your understand				0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	341/1352	4.46	4.09	3.98	4.10	4.46
	nd audiovisual techniques enhance your understand Discussion																
1. Did c	lass discu	ussions 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 a	all studer	nts actively encourag	ged 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 th	he instruc	ctor encourage fair a	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 te	echniques 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 f	for grading made clea	ır	15	1	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 288	****	3.82	3.68	3.87	****
		Field Work															
5. Did co	onferences	s 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 t	there enou	igh proctors for all	the students	17	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 110	***	****	3.99	3.92	****
			Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	 2	0.00-0.99 0	A 17			 mir	 ed f	or Ma	ior		0	Graduat		7	Majo		5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		r.e.	quil	eu I	OT INC	זטני	۵	U	Graduat	<b>C</b>	,	ria JC	) <u> </u>	5
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0		Co	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-2.99 0	D 0		GEI	пста	_				J	onder-9	Luu 1	۷.	INOII-	a JUL	7.7
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00 5	F 0		E1	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoud	rh
oraa.	,	2.30 1.00	P 0								•	respons				_	
			I O		Ot.1	her				1	.4	10050110					
			? 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

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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	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	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				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

			Fr	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	4	8	1 12	1086/1649	4.13	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	U	2	2	10	4.13	797/1648	4.13	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	3		****/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		1084/1533	3.73	4.21	4.04	4.28	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		0	2	0	3	0	10	4.07		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	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	1	0	0	2			442/1621				4.20	
J. now would jou grade one everall codoming crreceromens	-	Ü	-	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	1115	112, 1021	11.15	1.10	2.00	1.20	1.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	3		4.53	,	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		4.27	4.48	4.28	4.41	
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	
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		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		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		4.70	493/1368	4.70	4.73	4.30	4.56	
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	***
5. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified		U	O	_	O	O	O	2.00	, 333		1.01	1.20	1.00	
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	****
_		<u> </u>	,											
Freq	uency	DIST	trib	utioi	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	oe			Majors	
00-27 4 0.00-0.99 0 A 15		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e 1	.1	Majo	r	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0														
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	15
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0		_ =						_						
Grad. 11 3.50-4.00 13 F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	h
P 0							_	4	respons	es to b	e sign	ufican	ıt	
I 0		Oth	ner				1	.4						
? 0														

Course-Section: EDUC 663 0101 University of Maryland Page 626
Title ELEM SOC STUD METH Baltimore County
Instructor: FITZHUGH, WILLI Fall 2008
Enrollment: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questionnaires: 3

		Ouestion	a		MD	NA	Fr	_	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		e Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
			.s 															
		Genera	1															
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	433/1649	4.67	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.67
		ctor make clear		1 3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.38	4.23	4.34	5.00
		uations reflect		1 3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.42	4.20	4.35	5.00
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.50
				to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.35	4.10	4.35	5.0
		g system clearl		ained	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.34	4.16	4.29	5.00
	-	was class cand			1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.81	5.00
). How wo	ould you	grade the overa	.ll tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	234/1621	4.67	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.6
		Lectur	_															
		uctor's lecture			1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568			4.43	4.52	5.00
		ctor seem inter		3	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00
			explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.48	4.28	4.41	5.00	
		es contribute t		1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	695/1559	4.50	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.50	
Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.09	3.98	4.10	5.0
	Discussion																	
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	ed 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 th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.50
1. Were s	pecial t	echniques succe	ssful		1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.36	3.95	4.03	5.00
		Labora	tory															
5. Were r	equireme	nts for lab rep	orts cl	learly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.64	4.29	4.66	5.00
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria	for grading mad	e clear	<u>-</u>	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.82	3.68	3.87	4.00
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3		Re	anir		or Ma			0	Graduat	 e	1	Majo	 r	0	
28-55	0	В 0		100	-1 WILL	I	J_ 110	، ٢٠٠	_	•	JI dadac.	_	_	1100	-	3		
56-83	0	C 0		Ge:	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad	2	Non-	-major	3		
84-150	0	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	0	D 0				_				-	0.1001 9.		_	2.011		3
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		El	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
	=	2.22 2.00	_	P 0								-	respons				_	,
				I O		Ot:	her					3			5-			
				_ •		00.						-						

?

0

Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 627

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: EDUC 664 0101 University of Maryland Title SEC SOC STUD METH Instructor: JAKOVICS, KIMBE

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 4

4

			Fr	eque	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you 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	4.5
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	5.0
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	5.0
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	4.7
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	4.2
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	5.0
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	4.7
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	4.7
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	4.0
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	5.0
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	5.0
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	5.0
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	5.0
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	5.0
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	5.0
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.36	3.95	4.03	5.0
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	2.0
Frequ	ency.	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2		Re	 quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	2	 Мајс	 or	0

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2008

Course-Section: EDUC 665 0101 Title CREATIVE MEDIA-ECE Instructor: COSTELLO, MARGA

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 5

1

Grad.

2

3.50-4.00

0

0

Ρ I

?

1	Page	628
FEB	11,	2009
Job	IRBI	R3029

				_	ncies	5			tructor	Course	_			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	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		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	****		4.27	4.44	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	1		1067/1595	4.00		4.20	4.35	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	0	0	2		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		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	_	4.67	,			4.29		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		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		4.75	.,			4.30	4.56	
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	****
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re:	asons				Ту	ne			Majors	
Expected Grades						, - – – -								
00-27		Re	quire	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	е	1	Majo	r	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0		~		,				0	TT		4	37		-
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0		Ge	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	5
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0								_						

Electives

Other

0

3

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

Course-Section: EDUC 667 0101

GRAMMAR FOR AMER ENGL

Title 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

						Fr	eque:	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		General															
1 Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights, skills	rom this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	230/1649	4.86	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.86
		ctor make clear the		0	0	0	0	0	2	12		,		4.38	4.23		4.86
		estions reflect the		0	1	0	0	0	1			133/1375		4.54	4.27		4.92
		ations reflect the		0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64			4.42	4.20		4.64
			to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	2	8	4.80			4.21	4.04	4.28	4.80
			to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	- ,		4.35	4.10		4.69
		system clearly ex		1	0	0	0	0	_	12	4.92	97/1623		4.34	4.16		4.92
		was class cancelled		1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1646		4.76	4.69	4.81	
			eaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	2	8		133/1621					4.80
J. 110W WO	ara you g	jiade ene overair e	caching circuitychess	,	_	Ü	O	O	2	O	1.00	133/1021	1.00	1.10	1.00	1.20	1.00
		Lecture															
		actor's lectures we		0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.52	5.00
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor seem intereste	d in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00
			d explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.48	4.28	4.41	5.00
		es contribute to wh		0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.37	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did au	diovisual	l 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															
	oid class discussions contribute to wh			0	0	0	0	0				-,		4.51	4.08	4.30	4.86
			aged to participate	0	0	0	0	0				194/1382		4.73	4.29	4.52	4.93
			and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3		4.79	392/1368		4.73	4.30		
4. Were s	special te	echniques successfu	L	0	3	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	297/ 948	4.36	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.36
		Laboratory															
5. Were r	equiremen	nts for lab reports	clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	***	4.64	4.29	4.66	****
	_	-															
		Seminar															
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading made cl	ear	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 288	****	3.82	3.68	3.87	****
		Field Work															
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carry ou	field activities	9	0	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	232/ 312	3.40	3.95	3.68	3.83	3.40
			Frequ	ıency	7 Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 1	A 10		P 0			or Ma			0	 Graduat		9	Majo		10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		ке	quir	eu I	OT Mg	JOE	Ö	U	Graduat	C	J.	Ma J	JΙ	ΤÜ
26-55 56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	С 0		Co	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad	5	Non	-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Ge.	ııcı a	_				_	onder -g	_au	J	14011-	ilia JUI	4
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00 4	F 0		<b>г</b> 1.	ecti	WAG				1	#### -	Meane +	here =	re not	enous	rh
GI aa.		3.30 1.00 4	P 0		المنت	CCLI	v CD				_	respons					,
			I 0		O+1	her					9	LCBPOHB	CD CO L	,c 5191	ıııcaı	.10	
			2 0		00.						_						
			. 0														

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: EDUC 669 0101

8

ASSESS READING

SHELTON, NANCY

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 6

Page 630 FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Ouestion	g		MD	NA	Fre	_	ncies	5 1	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
			- 															
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.44	4.28	4.46	5.00
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	441/1648	4.60	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.60
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	****	4.54	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.42	4.20	4.35	5.00
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o 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	e gradin	g system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.50
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1340/1646	4.33	4.76	4.69	4.81	4.33
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	165/1621	4.75	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.75
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s 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	e instru	ctor seem inter	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00	
				xplained 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	e lectur	es contribute t	o 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 au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	303/1352	4.50	4.09	3.98	4.10	4.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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
				d 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	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d 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 s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful	-	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	104/ 948	4.80	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.80
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E		Cum. GPA		Ermonted Condon				D.a		_			m				M = + =	
creates E	arnea	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				ке 	asons				Ту:	pe 			Majors	; 
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	e	4	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	oe sign	ificar	nt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					6						
				? 0														

Course-Section: EDUC 678 0101 Title INST STRAT/DIV NEEDS BERGE, NANCY B

University of Maryland Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 631

Instructor: Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 14

Stude	ent Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Fr	equer	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		Genera	 1															
1. Did	you gain n	ew insights,ski		om 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 instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected 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 q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1375	****	4.54	4.27	4.44	***
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	417/1595	4.57	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.57
	_			what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.50
				to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	, -		4.35	4.10	4.35	4.43
		g system clearly		ained	0	0	0	0	0	2			145/1623	4.86	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.86
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	1		4.93	,	4.93	4.76	4.69		4.93
9. How	would you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	535/1621	4.38	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.38
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	s 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 instru	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 ma	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 lecture	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	audiovisua	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	152/1352	4.77	4.09	3.98	4.10	4.77
1 Did	class disc	Discus:		what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	478/1384	4.46	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.46
				ed to participate	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	593/1382	4.54	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.54
				nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2		4.69	493/1368	4.69		4.30	4.56	
		echniques succe			1	2	1	0	5	3	2	3.45	722/ 948		4.36	3.95	4.03	
		Labora																
5. Were	e requiremen		-	learly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.66	****
													, 555					
		Semina																
5. Were	criteria	for grading made	e clear	-	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.82	3.68	3.87	****
		Field !	Work															
5. Did	conference	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	***	3.95	3.68	3.83	****
				Frequ		Dia	- m i b		_									
				rrequ	lency	DIS	LLID	ucioi	.1									
Credits	Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	3		
00-27	2	A 13		Red	 guir	ed fo	or Ma	ior	 s	0	Graduat	 e	7	Majo	 or	1		
28-55											-	-		-		) \	-	=
56-83						Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									3				-	
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	9	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - I	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	ŗh
				P 0									response	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Ot1	ner				1	.3						
				? 0														

Course-Section: EDUC 681 8010

SURV OF INSTR TECH APP

Title KELLERMAN, PAUL

Instructor:

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 632 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course   Dept				Fre	mier	ncies	•		Tnet	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ceneral  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  2. Did the instructor nake clear the expected goals  3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals  5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  7. Was the orading system clearly explained  8. How many times was class cancelled  8. How many times was class cancelled  9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared  2. Did the instructor's each interested in the subject  3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  4. Did other cancers and the expected goals  A. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  6. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  7. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject  8. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  3. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  4. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  8. O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O	Ouestions	NR	NA					5				_			
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did their evaluations reflect the expected goals 6. Co 0 0 0 1 5 8.00 1/1375 5.00 4.54 4.27 4.44 5.00 7. Note that the examination of the expected goals 7. When the gradings contribute to what you learned 8. Did disting system clearly explained 8. Did with a satisfied expected goals 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Where the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Where the lectures contribute to what you learned 9. Did and overall teaching enhance your understanding 9. Did and overall teaching enhance your understanding 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Where the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Where you provided with adequate background information 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Where all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Where all students actively encouraged to participate 4. Where recessary materials available for lab amounced theme 2. Where requirements for lab reports clearly specified 2. Where requirements for prading made clear 3. Where all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Where a contribute to what you learned 3. Where contribute to what you learned 4. Where sepsial teachingues successful activities 5. Where requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6. Did or 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ***/ 25 5.00 ***/ 24 5.00 4.63 4.63 4.65 *** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 7. Did or 0 0 0 0 0	x														
2. bid the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 6 0 0 0 0 3 6 6 4.67 362/1648 4.67 4.38 4.23 4.34 4.67 7.  3. bid the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 6 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1375 5.00 4.85 4.27 4.44 5.00 4.01 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 5 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.63 174/1595 4.83 4.42 4.20 4.35 4.83 5.01 dasgined readings contribute to what you learned 0 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	General														
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 Abride revaluations reflect the expected goals 0 3 0 0 0 1 5 0 0 0 1 1/1375 5.00 4.54 4.27 4.45 4.85 4.83 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 5 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1333 5.00 4.21 4.04 4.28 5.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.63 174/1595 4.83 4.45 4.10 4.35 4.63 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.63 194/1512 4.63 4.35 4.10 4.35 4.63 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.69 130/1623 4.89 4.34 4.16 4.29 4.89 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 4 4.33 195/1621 4.33 4.18 4.06 4.20 4.33 1.00 4.00 1 1 4 4 4.33 195/1621 4.33 4.18 4.06 4.20 4.33 1.00 4.00 1 1 4 4 4.33 195/1621 4.33 4.18 4.06 4.20 4.33 1.00 4.00 1 1 4 4 4.33 195/1621 4.33 4.18 4.06 4.20 4.33 1.00 4.00 1 1 4 4 4.33 195/1621 4.33 4.18 4.06 4.20 4.33 1.00 4.00 1 1 4 4 4.33 195/1621 4.33 4.18 4.06 4.20 4.33 1.00 4.00 1 1 4 4 4.33 195/1621 4.33 4.18 4.06 4.20 4.33 1.00 1 1 4 4 4.33 195/1621 4.33 4.18 4.06 4.20 4.33 1.00 1 1 4 4 4.33 195/1621 4.33 4.18 4.06 4.20 4.33 1.00 1 1 4 4 4.33 195/1621 4.33 4.18 4.06 4.20 4.33 1.00 1 1 4 4 4.33 195/1621 4.33 4.18 4.06 4.20 4.33 1.00 1 1 4 4 4.33 195/1621 4.33 4.18 4.06 4.20 4.33 1.00 1 1 4 4 4.33 195/1621 4.33 4.18 4.06 4.20 4.33 1.00 1 1 4 4 4.33 1.00 1 1 4 4 4.33 1.00 1 1 4 4 4.33 1.00 1 1 4 4 4.33 1.00 1 4 4 4 4.33 1.00 1 4 4 4 4.33 1.00 1 4 4 4 4.33 1.00 1 4 4 4 4.33 1.00 1 4 4 4 4.33 1.00 1 4 4 4 4.33 1.00 1 4 4 4 4.33 1.00 1 4 4 4 4.33 1.00 1 4 4 4 4.33 1.00 1 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	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
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	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
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assigned readings you carry out learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 8 4.89 130/1623 4.89 4.34 4.16 4.29 4.89 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 0 0 0 0 0 1 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. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Were according to the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 5. Were point provided with adequate background information 7. Did the lab increases writerials available for lab activities 7. Did the lab increases writerials available for lab activities 7. Were you provided with adequate background information 8. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 9. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 1. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 2. Were requirements for lab reports olearly specified 3. Were requirements for lab reports olearly specified 4. Did presearch projects contribute to what you learned 5. Were requirements for lab reports olearly specified 7. O. O. O. O. D. S. D.O. *** 1.75 5.00 4.64 4.73 4.74 8. Did the lab increase with the departs of learned assistance 7. O. O. O. O. D. S. D.O. *** 1.75 5.00 4.64 4.65 8. Were criteria for grading made clear  1. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7. O. O. O. O. D. S. D.O. *** 1.75 5.00 4.64 4.65 8. Were pour contribute to what you learned 9. O. O. O. O. D. D. D.O. *** 1.75 5.00 4.64 4.65 9. Were criteria for grading made clear 9. Were criteria for grading made clear 9. O	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
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. Now many times was class cancelled 9. Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. No 0 0 0 1 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 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Were appecial techniques successful 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6. D.	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
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 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 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 0 1 7 4.88 287/1568 4.88 4.52 4.42 4.52 4.88 2.01d the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 287/1568 4.88 4.52 4.43 4.52 4.88 2.01d the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 287/1568 4.88 4.52 4.43 4.52 4.88 2.01d the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 8 4.89 227/1559 4.89 4.55 4.70 4.83 5.00 1/1572 5.00 4.75 4.58 4.70 4.83 5.00 1/1572 5.00 4.09 3.98 4.10 6.70 4.75 4.75 4.75 4.75 4.75 4.75 4.75 4.75	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
8. Now many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1/4 6 4 0.33 595/1621 4.33 4.18 4.06 4.20 4.33    **Did the would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4 4.33 595/1621 4.33 4.18 4.06 4.20 4.38    **Lecture**  1. Where the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 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 0 9 5.00 1/1572 5.00 4.85 5.00 4.98 4.70 4.83 5.00    3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 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 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	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
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4 4 4.33 595/1621 4.33 4.18 4.06 4.20 4.33	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
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9. Discussion 8. Discussion 9. Discussion 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did the instructor encouraged to participate 2. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful 4. Were special techniques understanding of the material 5. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 9. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 9. Did the lab instructor variable for individual attention 9. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 9. Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 9. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the what you learned 1. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 3. Were provided with degree and provided with the instructor helpful 3. Were p	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
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Were special techniques successful 1. Were you provided with adequate background information 1. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 7. O. O. O. O. O. D. S. 5.00 ****/ 285 **** 4.61 4.54 4.63 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 7. O. O. O. O. O. D. S. 5.00 ****/ 285 **** 4.61 4.54 4.63 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 7. O. O. O. O. O. D. S. 5.00 ****/ 285 **** 4.61 4.54 4.63 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 7. O. O. O. O. O. D. S. 5.00 ****/ 285 **** 4.61 4.54 4.63 **** 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7. O. O. O. O. O. D. S. 5.00 ****/ 285 **** 4.64 4.06 4.51 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 7. O. O. O. O. O. D. S. 5.00 ****/ 285 **** 4.64 4.06 4.51 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8. O. O. O	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
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Were special techniques successful 1. Were you provided with adequate background information 1. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 7. O. O. O. O. O. D. S. 5.00 ****/ 285 **** 4.61 4.54 4.63 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 7. O. O. O. O. O. D. S. 5.00 ****/ 285 **** 4.61 4.54 4.63 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 7. O. O. O. O. O. D. S. 5.00 ****/ 285 **** 4.61 4.54 4.63 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 7. O. O. O. O. O. D. S. 5.00 ****/ 285 **** 4.61 4.54 4.63 **** 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7. O. O. O. O. O. D. S. 5.00 ****/ 285 **** 4.64 4.06 4.51 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 7. O. O. O. O. O. D. S. 5.00 ****/ 285 **** 4.64 4.06 4.51 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8. O. O. O	T - who are														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8. Discussion 8. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were special techniques successful 2. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6. Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 7. Did crease and projects contribute to what you learned 8. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 9. Did conferences contribute to what you learned 9. Did conferences contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 9. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 9. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did sel		1	0	^	0	^	1	-	4 00	007/1560	4 00	4 50	4 42	4 50	4 00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			-					-							
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did the instructor available for individual attention 7. Did you was also what you learned 7. Did yes entirely a your provided with adequate background information 7. Did you was also you was you was also you was you was also you was you was you was also you was you wa		-				-	-	-							
Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Did class discussions contribute to what you learned to participate to the participate t		-	-			-	-								
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1. Do 0 0 1 0 0 8 5.00 1/1382 5.00 4.73 4.39 4.56 4.75  4. Were special techniques successful  1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  2. Were special techniques successful  2. Were you provided with adequate background information  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  3. Did the lab instructor provide assistance  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  6. D.															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 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 4.66 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 ****/ 243 **** 5.00 4.04 4.73 ****   5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 240 ****   5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 240 ****   5. Was the instructor available for individual attention 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 4.61 4.54 4.63 ****   2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 4.63 4.47 4.50 ****   5. Were criteria for grading made clear 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 4.63 4.47 4.50 ****   5. Were criteria for grading made clear 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 288 **** 3.82 3.68 3.87 ****   5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** 4.64 4.06 4.51 ****   5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 7 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** 4.64 4.06 4.51 ****   5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 7 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.30 4.37 ****   5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 7 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.34 4.33 ****   5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 7 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.34 4.33 ****   5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 7 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.34 4.37 ****   5. Did self-paced	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
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 0 8 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 4.76 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 ****/ 212 **** 5.00 4.12 4.61 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 212 **** 5.00 4.14 4.73 ****  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 212 **** 5.00 4.40 4.73 ****  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 212 **** 4.61 4.54 4.63 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 7 0 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 0 2 5.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.61 4.54 4.53 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.61 4.54 4.53 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.64 4.04 4.73 ****  4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 4.64 4.06 4.51 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 7 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** 4.64 4.06 4.51 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 7 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.33 4.43 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 7 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.64 4.04 4.75 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 7 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.64 4.06 4.51 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 8 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 54 **** **** 4.43 4.43 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 24 ***** **** 4.47 4.42	Discussion														
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 0 8 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 4.76 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 ****/ 212 **** 5.00 4.12 4.61 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 212 **** 5.00 4.14 4.73 ****  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 212 **** 5.00 4.40 4.73 ****  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 212 **** 4.61 4.54 4.63 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 7 0 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 0 2 5.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.61 4.54 4.53 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.61 4.54 4.53 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.64 4.04 4.73 ****  4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 4.64 4.06 4.51 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 7 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** 4.64 4.06 4.51 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 7 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.33 4.43 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 7 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.64 4.04 4.75 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 7 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.64 4.06 4.51 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 8 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 54 **** **** 4.43 4.43 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 24 ***** **** 4.47 4.42		1	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	359/1384	4.63	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful  Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8. O 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 221 **** **** 4.16 4.27 ***** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7. O 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 243 **** 5.00 4.12 4.61 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7. O 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 212 **** 5.00 4.12 4.61 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7. O 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 212 **** 5.00 4.12 4.61 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7. O 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 212 **** 5.00 4.12 4.61 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 7. O 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 209 **** **** 4.35 4.80 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 7. O 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 4.61 4.54 4.63 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 7. O 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.61 4.54 4.63 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 7. O 0 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. O 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.61 4.54 4.63 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 7. O 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.64 4.06 4.51 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 7. O 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. O 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** 4.60 4.47 4.58 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 7. O 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 39 **** 4.60 4.47 4.58 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 7. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8. O 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 ****/ 53 ****  Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7. O 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 ****/ 54 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 8. O 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 8. O 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **			0	0				8							
Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  2. Were you provided with adequate background information  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance  7. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 2. 5.00 ****/ 221 **** **** 4.16 4.27 ****  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance  7. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 2. 5.00 ****/ 221 **** 5.00 4.42 4.61 ****  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  6. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 2. 5.00 ****/ 209 **** **** 4.35 4.80 ****  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  7. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 2. 5.00 ****/ 209 **** **** 4.53 4.67 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 ****/ 88 **** 4.61 4.54 4.63 ****  4. Did presearch projects contribute to what you learned  7. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 2. 5.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.63 4.47 4.50 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned  7. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 2. 5.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.63 4.47 4.43 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear  7. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 2. 5.00 ****/ 22 **** 4.64 4.06 4.51 ****  8. Was the instructor available for consultation  7. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 2. 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 3.82 3.68 3.87 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  8. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 2. 5.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.64 4.06 4.51 ****  8. Was the instructor available for consultation  7. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0.			-												
Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material								2							
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 ****/ 212 *** 5.00 4.40 4.73 **** 5.00 for the provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 212 *** 5.00 4.40 4.73 **** 5.00 for the provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 212 *** 5.00 4.40 4.73 **** 5.00 for the provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 212 *** 5.00 4.40 4.73 **** 5.00 for the provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 212 *** 5.00 4.40 4.73 **** 5.00 for the provide assistance 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0															
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 0 2 5.00 **** / 209 **** 4.34 4.80 **** 5.00 4.40 4.73 **** 5.00 4.40 4.73 **** 5.00 4.40 4.73 **** 5.00 4.40 4.73 **** 5.00 4.40 4.73 **** 5.00 4.40 4.73 **** 5.00 4.40 4.73 **** 5.00 4.40 4.73 **** 5.00 4.40 4.73 **** 5.00 4.40 4.73 **** 5.00 4.40 4.73 **** 5.00 5.00 **** 5.00 **** 5.00 *** 5.00 ****	Laboratory														
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 0 2 5.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.61 4.54 4.63 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 4.63 4.47 4.50 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 81 **** 4.47 4.43 4.43 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 7 0 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 2 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 4.64 4.06 4.51 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 7 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** 4.60 4.47 4.58 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 7 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.36 4.38 4.44 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 7 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 3.95 3.68 3.83 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.30 4.37 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.43 4.43 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** **** 4.42 4.67 ****	1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.27	****
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 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 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 81 **** 4.47 4.43 4.43 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 288 **** 3.82 3.68 3.87 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 7 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 39 **** 4.60 4.47 4.58 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 7 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 39 **** 4.60 4.47 4.58 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 7 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 31 **** 3.95 3.68 3.83 **** 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 39 **** 4.30 4.37 **** 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 39 **** 4.30 4.37 **** 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 39 **** 4.30 4.37 **** 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 41 **** 4.30 4.37 **** 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 41 **** 4.30 4.37 **** 4. Self Paced 8. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 41 **** 4.42 4.43 4.43 **** 4.44 4.45 4.45 4.46 4.46 4.46 4.46 4.46	2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 243	****	5.00	4.12	4.61	****
Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8. O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O	3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.73	****
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 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** **** 4.30 4.37 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.42 4.67 ****	4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.80	****
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 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 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** 4.60 4.47 4.58 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 7 1 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 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 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 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
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 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 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** 4.60 4.47 4.58 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 7 1 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 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 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 ****	Combination														
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 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 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 7 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** 4.60 4.47 4.58 ****  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 1 5.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.30 4.37 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 8 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 ****		7	Λ	Λ	Λ	Λ	Λ	2	E 00	****/ 00	****	1 61	1 51	1 62	****
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 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 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 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 **** 4.44 4.45 4.45 4.45 4.45 4.45 4.45										,					
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 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 ****			-	-	-	-	-	_							
Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 288 **** 4.64 4.06 4.51 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 7 0 0 0 0 0 1 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 ****			-	-		-	•	2		, -					
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 1 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 ****								2		, -					
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 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 Criteria for grading made crear	,	U	U	U	U	U	۷	5.00	/ 200		3.04	3.00	3.07	
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 ****	Field Work														
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 ****		8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.64	4.06	4.51	****
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 ****	<u> </u>	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.60		4.58	****
Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  7		7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****			4.44	****
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 ***	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·										****				****
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 ***	<del>-</del>														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 8 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 1 5.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.42 4.67 ****	*****	-	0	0	0	0	0	^	F 00	****			4 20	4 25	44.4.4.
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 8 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.42 4.67 ****							-	_		, 55	***				
	-						-	_		,	****	****			
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 110 **** **** 3.99 3.92 ****							-	_			****	****			
	5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l 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	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	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	Ī
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 682 8010 University of Maryland Title

INST TECH DESIGN/DEV

Instructor: WALSH, GREGORY

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 9

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

Baltimore County

Page 633 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

							Fre	quer	ıcıes	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	гелет	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did you	ı gain new	insights,skil	lls fro	m 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	e instruct	or make clear	the ex	pected 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	e exam que	stions reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1375	****	4.54	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did oth	ner evalua	tions reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	853/1595	4.22	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.22
5. Did ass	signed rea	dings contribu	ite 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 wr	itten assi	.anments contri	ibute t	what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	651/1512	4.29	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.29
		system clearly			0	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	968/1623	4.11	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.11
		as class cance			0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	697/1646	4.89	4.76	4.69	4.81	4.89
	-			ning effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	547/1621		4.18	4.06	4.20	4.38
J. 110W WO	ara you gr	ade the overal	rr ccac.	iring criccerveness	_	Ü	Ü	O	-	3	-	1.50	31//1021	1.50	1.10	1.00	1.20	1.50
		Lecture	_															
1 Wara th	no inatrua	tor's lectures		aranarad	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	1 22	1145/1568	4.22	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.22
		or seem interes			0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00
										3	5							
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	1			4.44	728/1564	4.44	4.48	4.28	4.41	4.44
		contribute to			0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	640/1559	4.56	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.56
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	nance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	208/1352	4.67	4.09	3.98	4.10	4.67
		Discuss																
				what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	613/1384	4.33	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.33
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	262/1382	4.89	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.89
				d 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 sp	pecial tec	hniques succes	ssful		0	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	97/ 948	4.86	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.86
		Laborat	cory															
1. Did the	e lab incr	ease understar	nding o	f the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.27	****
			_	ground information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	5.00	4.12	4.61	****
				or lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.73	****
		ructor provide			8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.80	****
				early specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.66	****
J. WEIE I	equitement	s for tab repo	JI CB CI	earry specified	O	U	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	/ 333		1.01	1.27	1.00	
		Self E	2222															
2 1/2				b-1f1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ <u>4</u> 1	++++	++++	4.43	1 12	++++
-		ts with the ir		-	8	0		0	-	0	1		/ 11				4.43	
		tutoring by p		_	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.67	***
5. Were th	nere enoug	h proctors for	r all t.	ne students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.92	****
				_														
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	tion	1									
	_																	
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3			Tyl	pe			Majors	}	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	quire	d fo	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	2	3	Majo	r	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	neral					4	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ŗh
				P 0									response				_	
				I O		Oth	ner					5					-	
				? 0		001						-						

Course-Section: EDUC 688 0101

Title METHODOLOGY TEACH ESL

Instructor: NELSON, JOHN E.

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 13

Fall 2008

Page 634 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
x														
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		0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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			•		•	_	_						4 = 0	****
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		****/ 81	****	4.47	4.43	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.53	4.35	4.42	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	U	0	1	0	1	Τ	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		****/ 48	****	4.04	4.06	4.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****				****
	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	4.60 4.36	4.47 4.38	4.58 4.44	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	1	0	4	1		181/ 312		3.95	3.68		3.83
5. Did conferences help you carry out freid activities	/	U	U	1	U	4	Τ	3.03	101/ 312	3.03	3.95	3.00	3.03	3.03
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		****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.49	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.43	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.92	****
5. Here there changin proceeds for all the stadeness		_	J	_	J	_	J	3.00	, 110			3.22	3.72	

Course-Section: EDUC 688 0101

Title METHODOLOGY TEACH ESL

Instructor: NELSON, JOHN

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 13

NELSON, JOHN E. Fall 2008

Page 634 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9	-			
				?	1						

University of Maryland ADV SPEC TOP IN EDUC Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Page 635 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	7	
Questionnaires:	6	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: EDUC 689 8010

PETSKA, DEBORAH

Title

Instructor:

Ouestions				NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5		ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		Genera	_								_							
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	0	0 1	6	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.44	4.28	4.46	5.00
		ctor make clear			0 1	1	0	0	0	0	5 4	4.83 5.00	195/1648 1/1375	4.83	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.83
	id the exam questions reflect the expected goals id other evaluations reflect the expected goals						0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.42	4.20	4.35	5.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.21	4.04	4.28	5.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	142/1512	4.83	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.83
		g system clearl			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.34	4.16	4.29	5.00
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	782/1646	4.83	4.76	4.69	4.81	4.83
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	165/1621	4.75	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.75
		Lectur	е															
		uctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.52	5.00
		ctor seem inter		3	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00
		_		xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.48	4.28	4.41	5.00
		es contribute t	-		0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.37	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did aud	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						0	0	0	1	5	4.83	123/1352	4.83	4.09	3.98	4.10	4.83
Discussion																		
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.51	4.08	4.30	5.00
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.52	5.00
		ctor encourage echniques succe		d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6 6	5.00 5.00	1/1368 1/ 948	5.00 5.00	4.73	4.30	4.56	5.00
4. Were St	eciai te	eciniiques succe	SSIUI		U	U	U	U	U	U	0	5.00	1/ 540	5.00	4.30	3.93	4.03	3.00
		Semina	_															
	_	-		announced theme	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	4.61	4.54	4.63	5.00
				lvidual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.63	4.47	4.50	5.00
	_	_		what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 81	5.00	4.47	4.43	4.43	5.00
		ons contribute		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 cr	riteria i	for grading mad	e clear		4	0	U	U	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 288	5.00	3.82	3.68	3.87	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	 guire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	4	Majo	 or	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			-			_						J -		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				4	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0													-	
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner					2						
? 0																		

Course-Section: EDUC 689G 8010

Serious Games

Raudenbush

Baltimore County (Instr. A) Fall 2008

Page 8 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	
Questionnaires:	

Title

Instructor:

6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

				Student Cot				~										
Questions							Fre	equer 2	cies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General	 1															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,skil	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	247/1649	****	4.52	4.28	4.11	4.83
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1648	****	4.35	4.23	4.16	5.00
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	t the e	xpected 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	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	1	0	3	2	4.00	815/1533	****	4.01	4.04	3.87	4.00
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	142/1512	****	4.35	4.10	3.86	4.83
		g system clearly		ined	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.67	321/1623	****	4.22	4.16	4.08	4.67
	-	was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1646		4.85	4.69	4.67	
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overal	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	165/1621	****	4.07	4.06	3.96	4.63
		Lecture	e															
1. Were th	ne instru	actor's lectures	s well p	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1568	****	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.92
		ctor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	****	4.82	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presented	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1564	****	4.29	4.28	4.20	4.90
		es contribute to		-	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83		****	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.92
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	0	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1130/1352	****	3.91	3.98	3.86	3.67
		Discuss																
l. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contribu	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	****	4.39	4.08	3.86	5.00
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1382	****	4.49	4.29	4.03	5.00
		_		d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1368	****	4.43	4.30	4.01	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 948	****	4.24	3.95	3.75	5.00
		Laborat	tory															
2. Were yo	ou provid	ded with adequat	te back	ground information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.43	4.12	4.08	****
				or lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 212	****	4.91	4.40	4.43	****
5. Were re	equiremer	nts for lab repo	orts cl	early specified	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 555	***	4.01	4.29	4.14	5.00
		Seminar																
				announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 88	****	4.75	4.54	4.31	****
				ividual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85	****	4.38	4.47	4.30	****
	_	-		what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 81	****	4.67	4.43	4.39	****
5. Were cr	riteria f	for grading made	e clear		3	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	229/ 288	***	3.36	3.68	3.54	3.00
		Field W																
5. Did cor	nferences	s help you carry	y out f	ield activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	***	3.81	3.68	3.51	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	tribu	utior	ı									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Ту	pe			Majors	
 00-27	·								r Ma			0	 Graduat		3	 Mo∹o		0
28-55						ĸe(	4utr.	zu IC	ır ı™a	יייייייייייייייייייייייי	>	J	Graduat	_	J	Majo	) <u>T</u>	U
	6-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					Cer	nera:	1				4	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	-major	0
56-83						Gel	c.a.	-				-	onder -g	Laa	٦	14011-		U
Grad. 3 3.50-4.00 3 F 0					E. J.	activ	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - Means there ar			re not	enona	rh	
grad. 3 3.50-4.00 3 F 0					Electives							•	#### - Means there an responses to be signi					
						Ot.1	her					0	respons	CD CC 2		iiiii		

Course-Section: EDUC 689G 8010 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Serious Games

Instructor: Sugar, Steve (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 0 Questionnaires: 6

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page

Job IRBR3029

								201101	ncies			Tnet	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5		Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
! 3		General			•	•				_	_	4 00	0.45 /4.540		4 = 0	4 00		4 00
-	_	v insights,skil			0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	247/1649	****	4.52	4.28	4.11	4.83
		or make clear			0	0 5	0	0	0	0 1	6 0	5.00	1/1648 ****/1375	****	4.35 4.38	4.23	4.16 4.10	5.00 ***
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.00	174/1595	****	4.38	4.27	4.10	4.83
	<ul><li>4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals</li><li>5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned</li></ul>						0	1	0	3	2	4.00	815/1533	****	4.30	4.20	3.87	4.00
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	142/1512	****	4.35	4.10	3.86	4.83
		system clearly		_	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	321/1623	****	4.22	4.16	4.08	4.67
		vas class cance	_	IIICa	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1646	****	4.85	4.69	4.67	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	374/1621	****	4.07	4.06	3.96	4.63
	. 3			5														
1 Wassa + h		Lecture			0	0	0	0	^	1	_	4 02	244/1560	++++	4 50	4 42	4 20	4 00
		ctor's lectures for seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	1	5 6	4.83	344/1568 1/1572	****	4.50 4.82	4.43	4.39 4.64	4.92 5.00
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	263/1564	****	4.02	4.70	4.20	4.90
		s contribute to		-	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1559	****	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.92
				our understanding	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	690/1352	****	3.91	3.98		3.67
J. DIG auc	ilovisuai	ceciniiques em	lance y	our understanding	1	U	U	U	2	_	2	1.00	050/1332		3.71	3.90	3.00	3.07
		Discuss																
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	****	4.39	4.08	3.86	5.00
		_	_	d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1382	****	4.49	4.29	4.03	5.00
		_		d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1368	****	4.43	4.30	4.01	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial ted	chniques succes	sstul		0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 948	****	4.24	3.95	3.75	5.00
		Laborat	cory															
2. Were yo	ou provide	ed with adequat	e back	ground information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	***	4.43	4.12	4.08	***
3. Were ne	ecessary r	materials avail	lable f	or lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	***	4.91	4.40	4.43	****
5. Were re	equirement	s for lab repo	orts cl	early specified	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 555	****	4.01	4.29	4.14	5.00
		Seminar	_															
1 Were as	reigned to			announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 88	****	4.75	4.54	4.31	****
				ividual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.38	4.47	4.30	****
				what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 81	****	4.67	4.43	4.39	****
	_	or grading made		what you rearned	3	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	, -	****	3.36	3.68	3.54	3.00
3. Mere er		or grading made	JULUAL		J		Ü	_	_	_	Ů	3.00	223, 200		3.30	3.00	3.31	3.00
		Field W																
5. Did cor	nferences	help you carry	out f	ield activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.81	3.68	3.51	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	tribu	ıtioı	ı									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27						Re	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	е	3	Majo	r	0
28-55						~		,				4	**************************************		2	37		0
						Ge	neral	L				4	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	-major	0
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 3 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						77.7	0 a t i -					0	шшш.	Moor- +	hor-			h
Grad.	Grad. 3 3.50-4.00 3 F 0					EΙ	ectiv	/es				U	#### - 1				_	11
						O+1	her					0	respons	es lo D	e sign	ıııcar	16	
						UL.	TICT					J						
? 0																		

Course-Section: EDUC 771 8750

RESEARCH DESIGNS IN ED

Title 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

Quantitation	NR NA			equer			-		tructor	_		ept UMBC Level ean Mean Mean		Sect
Questions	NK	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		1094/1648		4.38	4.23	4.34	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	16	0	0	0	0	3		****/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		4.35	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		4.16	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														
<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> </ol>	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	852/1568		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		4.85	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		4.37	4.29		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			•	•	_	_	•			4 00		4 00	4 00	4 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	9	8	4.32	633/1384		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		4.73	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		4.73	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		****/ 88	***	4.61	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 85	****	4.63	4.47	4.50	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 81	****	4.47	4.43	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 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	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out fred activities	1.0	U	U		U	U	U	2.00	/ 312		3.93	3.00	3.03	
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

Credits Earned Cum			A	Expecte	ed 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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19	-		_	
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 781 8720 TEACHER LEADERSHIP Baltimore County Instructor: RUEHL, SCOTT

Title

Enrollment:

24

University of Maryland Page 637 FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	21	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------------	----	---------	--------	------------	---------------

	Questions				NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	s 4	5		ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	-	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	_		•	•	•			_		4 50		4 = 0		4 00		4 50
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	2 0	6	13	4.52	617/1649	4.52	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.52
		ctor make clear uestions reflec			0	0 15	0	0	0	5 0	16 6	4.76 5.00	253/1648 1/1375		4.38 4.54	4.23	4.34	4.76 5.00
		uestions reflect uations reflect			0	12	0	0	0	U	16	4.76	227/1595		4.42	4.27	4.44	4.76
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	Ω	13	4.76	,		4.42	4.20	4.33	4.76
				to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	331/1512		4.35	4.10	4.35	4.57
		g system clearl			0	0	0	0	0	7	18	4.86	145/1623		4.34	4.16	4.29	4.86
		was class cand		ilica	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	-,		4.76	4.69		4.71
				ching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	288/1621		4.18	4.06		4.60
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	19	4.81	387/1568	4.81	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.81
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1572		4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00
	as lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	216/1564		4.48	4.28	4.41	4.86
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	318/1559	4.81	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.81
5. Did au	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandir					0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	177/1352	4.71	4.09	3.98	4.10	4.71
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	ed 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	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd 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 s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	97/ 948	4.86	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.86
		Labora	-															
5. Were r	equireme	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.66	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	00-27 8 0.00-0.99 0 A 19						anir	 ed f	or Ma			0	 Graduat	 e	9	Majo		0
28-55						110	datt.	cu I	J_ 1/1C	ביינ ג	5	J	Gradat	_	-	1.10. ) (	<i>,</i> _	U
56-83						Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	2	Non-	major	21
84-150						001		_				-	011001 9	1		2.011		
Grad.						Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoue	ıh
	9 3.30 4.00 / P 0										-	respons					•	
	I 0					Otl	her				1	.9			5			
? 0 I 0																		

Course-Section: EDUC 782 0101 Title ISSUES IN ECE Instructor: SMALL, SUE

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 6

7

Fall 2008

University of Maryland Page 638 Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

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

	Questions					Fr 1	eque 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General															
1. Did you	u gain n	ew insights, skills fi	om this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1057/1649	4.17	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.17
		ctor make clear the e		0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	362/1648	4.67	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.67
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflect the	expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	***	4.54	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did otl	her eval	uations reflect the e	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 ass	signed r	eadings 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
		signments contribute		0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	782/1512	4.17	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.17
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearly exp	ained	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	720/1623	4.33	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.33
8. How man	ny 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 wor	uld you	grade the overall tea	aching 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 th	he instr	uctor'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	e instru	ctor 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 led	cture ma	terial 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	e lectur	es 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 aud	diovisua	l 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 cla	ass disc	ussions 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 a	.ll stude:	nts actively encourag	ged 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	e instru	ctor encourage fair a	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 sp	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussic Were special techniques successful					0	1	0	2	3	4.17	380/ 948	4.17	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.17
		Laboratory															
5. Were re	equireme	nts for lab reports o	clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.66	****
		Seminar															
1. Were as	ssigned	topics relevant to tl	ne 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	e instru	ctor available for i	ndividual attention	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.63	4.47	4.50	5.00
		rojects contribute to		1	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	35/ 81	4.67	4.47	4.43	4.43	4.67
4. Did pre	esentati	ons contribute to wha	at you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	35/ 92	4.60	4.53	4.35	4.42	4.60
		for grading made clea		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 fie	eld expe	rience 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	u clearl	y understand your eva	aluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.22	4.09	4.47	5.00
		ctor available for co		2	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.60	4.47	4.58	****
4. To what	t degree	could you discuss yo	our evaluations	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.36	4.38	4.44	5.00
5. Did co	5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities					0	0	0	1	1	4.50	28/ 312	4.50	3.95	3.68	3.83	4.50
Fre					Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				P.e	asons	3			Ту	ne			Majors	:
00-27 28-55	1 0	0.00-0.99 0 1.00-1.99 0	A 6 B 0		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	\$	0	Graduat	е	5	Majo	r	0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0		Co.	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	1	Non	major	6
84-150	0						_				U	onder-9	Luu	_	INOII-	a JUL	U
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00 5	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1		here a		_	ţh

Other

6

Ρ

I

?

0

0

Course-Section: EDUC 791P 0101

Title PRACTICUM IN ED SEC 7-

Instructor: MURPHY, JOYCE A

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 13

Fall 2008

Page 639 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	mier	ncies			Tng	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	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		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
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	1	0	0	4	1	1	6		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		****/1572	****	4.85	4.70	4.83	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1564	****	4.48	4.28	4.41	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1559	****	4.37	4.29	4.41	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/1352	****	4.09	3.98	4.10	****
Discussion	0	0	1	0	2	2	7	4 1 5	722/1204	4 1 5	<i>1</i> F1	4 00	4 20	4 1 5
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	•	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	732/1384		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	U	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		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		4.38
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	2	3	0	1	7	3.62			3.82	3.68	3.87	
or word orrotta for grading made orear	ŭ	Ü	-	J	Ü	_	•	3.02	103, 200	3.02	3.02	3.00	3.07	3.02
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	,	****	****	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		****/ 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 E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 791S 0101 University of Maryl Title PRAC IN ED TESOL K-12 Baltimore County Instructor: WILSON, MARGARE Fall 2008

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 640 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	7	
Questionnaires:	5	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions				MD	NA	Fre	_	ncies	5 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Quescions	, . – – – – – –															
		General	=															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,skil	ls 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	e instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.00
		uestions reflect			0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1375	****	4.54	4.27	4.44	****
. Did oth	her evalu	uations reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	890/1595	4.20	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.20
. Did ass	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	680/1533	4.20	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.20
. Did wr	itten ass	signments contri	bute 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
. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	explai explai	ned	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1496/1623	3.20	4.34	4.16	4.29	3.20
. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	833/1646	4.80	4.76	4.69	4.81	4.80
How wor	uld you g	grade the overal	.l teach	ing effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1429/1621	3.33	4.18	4.06	4.20	3.33
		Lecture	<u>:</u>															
L. Were th	he instru	actor's lectures	well p	repared	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1385/1568	3.80	4.52	4.43	4.52	3.80
. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem intere	sted in	the subject	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	1419/1572	4.20	4.85	4.70	4.83	4.20
		erial presented			0	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1360/1564	3.60	4.48	4.28	4.41	3.60
		es contribute to			0	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1408/1559	3.40	4.37	4.29	4.41	3.40
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						2	0	1	0	1		1301/1352		4.09	3.98	4.10	2.50
l Did ala	ace dieci	Discuss ussions contribu		hat you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	3 25	1192/1384	3.25	4.51	4.08	4.30	3.25
		nts actively end			1	0	0	0	0	2	2		616/1382		4.73	4.29	4.52	4.50
				open discussion	1	0	2	0	0	0	2		1286/1368		4.73	4.30	4.56	3.00
		echniques succes		open arseassion	1	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	,		4.36	3.95	4.03	3.50
		Seminar																
. Were ci	riteria f	Seminar For grading made			4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	***	3.82	3.68	3.87	***
5. Did cor	nferences	Field W s help you carry		eld activities	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	3.95	3.68	3.83	****
,, più 00i	01 0110 01	o noip you ourly	040 11			-	-	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	2.00	, 312		3.75	3.00	3.03	
				Frequ	.ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors				
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 3						Red	auir	ed f	or Ma	iors	· – – –	0	 Graduat	 e	3	Majo	 or	 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1						,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		-		-	-	) (		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	-major	0
84-150						001		_				-	011001 9		_	1.011		3
Grad.						E14	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoud	h
				P 0		111	CCL	v CD				•	respons				_	
	I 0 Other							5	I CBPOIIB		,c 5191	ıııcaı	10					
				5 0		001						_						
		f U																

Baltimore County

University of Maryland Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions					NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General			•			•	_	_							
		ew insights, skills from		0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	590/1649	3.98	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.55
		ctor make clear the e	-	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	629/1648	4.28	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.45
	_	estions reflect the		1	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.54	4.27	4.44	5.00
		ations reflect the e	_	0	1 0	0	0	3	2	8	4.80	192/1595	4.27	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.80
	_	eadings contribute to	_	0	-	-	1	-	4	3		1006/1533	3.94	4.21	4.04	4.28	3.82
		signments contribute	_	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	451/1512	4.34	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.45
		g system clearly explanation	ainea	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	164/1623	4.64	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.82
	-	was class cancelled		0	0	-	-		0	11	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How wor	ula you g	grade the overall tea	ching 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 cla	ass discu	ussions 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
		nts actively encourage	-	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	616/1382	4.33	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.50
		ctor encourage fair a		1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	493/1368	4.46	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.70
		echniques successful	-	1	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	533/ 948	3.30	4.36	3.95	4.03	3.90
E Moreo m		Laboratory	loowly amonified	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4 00	****/ 555	****	1 61	4.29	4.66	****
5. were re	equiremen	nts for lab reports c	rearry specified	9	U	U	U	1	U	Τ	4.00	****/ 555		4.64	4.29	4.00	
		Seminar															
1. Were as	ssigned t	copics relevant to the	e 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	e instruc	ctor available for in	dividual attention	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	32/ 85	4.73	4.63	4.47	4.50	4.73
3. Did res	search pr	rojects 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 pre	esentatio	ons contribute to wha	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 c	riteria f	for grading made clea:	c .	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 fi	eld exper	rience 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
		understand your eval		0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	18/ 48	4.45	4.22	4.09	4.47	4.45
		ctor available for con		0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	14/ 39	4.82	4.60	4.47		4.82
		could you discuss you		0	2	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	18/ 39	4.56	4.36	4.38	4.44	4.56
	_	s help you carry out		0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	24/ 312		3.95	3.68		4.64
			Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
		Cum. GPA	_													_	
Credits Ea	arned 	Expected Grades				Re	asons	; 			Ту:	pe 			Majors 	;	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 11		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	e	5	Majo	or	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	в 0			-			-						,		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0 3.00-3.49 0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	-major	11
84-150	D 0																
Grad. 5 3.50-4.00 10 F 0					El	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh
P 0												respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
I 0					Ot!	her				1	1						
			? 0														

Course-Section: EDUC 792 2303

Title ISD INTERNSHIP Instructor: ZONGKER, SHIRLE

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 11

Page 641 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029 Course-Section: EDUC 792 2304 University of Maryland Page 642
Title ISD INTERNSHIP Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009

Instructor: ZONGKER, SHIRLE (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 11
Ouestionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Fall 2008

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 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 1 0 0 0 2 0 7 4.56 448/1623 4.64 4.34 4.16 4.29 4.56 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 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 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 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1568 4.38 4.52 4.43 4.52 4.38 9 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1572 4.88 4.85 4.70 4.83 4.88 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 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 4.334. 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 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 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 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 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 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 312 4.64 3.95 3.68 3.83 \*\*\*\* Frequency Distribution Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Credits Earned Required for Majors 0 Graduate 2 Major 0 General 0 Under-grad 8 Non-major 10 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 9 ? 0

Course-Section: EDUC 792 2304 University of Maryland Page 643 FEB 11, 2009 Baltimore County

Title ISD INTERNSHIP (Instr. B)

Instructor:

Enrollment: 11 Ouestionnaires: 10

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 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  $1 \quad 0 \quad 0$ 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 8 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 555 \*\*\*\* 4.64 4.29 4.66 \*\*\*\* 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 9 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 88 4.27 4.61 4.54 4.63 \*\*\*\* 0 0 0 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 \*\*\*\* 9 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 92 4.45 4.53 4.35 4.42 \*\*\*\* 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 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 Majors Reasons \_\_\_\_\_\_ 00-27 0.00-0.99 0 Required for Majors 0 Graduate Major 28-55 8 1.00-1.99 0 в 2 C 0 2.00-2.99 0 56-83 0 General 0 Under-grad Non-major 10 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough Grad. 3.50-4.00 6 responses to be significant I 0 Other

Course-Section: EDUC 792L 0101

Title INT IN EDU TESOL K-12

IIII IN EDO IEDOD

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

				_	ncie	5	_		ructor	Course	_		Level	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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		****/ 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	0.00	****/ 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	***
Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	utio	n									

#### Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 794 0101 University of Maryland Title ISD PROJECT SEMINAR

Baltimore County KINERNEY, DONNA Fall 2008

Instructor: Enrollment: 9 Ouestionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 645

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 4 4.44 723/1649 4.44 4.44 4.28 4.46 4.44 5 4.33 797/1648 4.33 4.38 4.23 4.34 4.33 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 8 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1375 \*\*\*\* 4.54 4.27 4.44 \*\*\*\* 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 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 00 2 6 4.56 345/1512 4.56 4.35 4.10 4.35 4.56 1 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 9 5.00 0 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 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 Ω Ω Ω 4 4.67 636/1568 4.67 4.52 4.43 4.52 4.67 2 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 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 4.50 437/1384 4.50 4.51 4.08 4.30 4.50 5 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 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 1 0 2 4.33 310/948 4.33 4.36 3.95 4.03 4.33 Laboratory 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 555 \*\*\*\* 4.64 4.29 4.66 \*\*\*\* 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 0 0 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 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 E	arned	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	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		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	Ĺ
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: EDUC 795 0101 University of Maryland Page 646
Title SEM STUDY TEACHING Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Instructor: SCHAFFER, EUGEN Fall 2008
Enrollment: 5

Stude	nt Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
-------	-----------	------------	---------------

Questionnaires: 3

	Questions			NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
General																		
1 Did vo	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
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1648	4.76	4.38	4.23	4.34	5.00
		ations reflect			0	0	0	1	0	1	1		1335/1595	3.99	4.42	4.20	4.35	3.67
			_	hat you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	815/1533	3.97	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	263/1512	4.60	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.67
		system clearly		_	0	0	0	0	0	2	1			3.72	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.33
		was class cance	_		0	0	0	0	1	0	2		1340/1646		4.76	4.69	4.81	4.33
	-			ing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	0		1261/1621		4.18	4.06		3.67
		Lecture	<b>=</b>															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures	s well p	repared	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1279/1568	4.35	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.00
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested 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 le	cture mat	erial presented	d and ex	plained 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	e lecture	es contribute to	o what y	ou learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1322/1559	4.16	4.37	4.29	4.41	3.67
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ate to w	hat 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 a	ll studer	nts actively end	couraged	l 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	e instruc	ctor encourage :	fair and	l 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 s	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	4.67	4.36	3.95	4.03	5.00
		Labora	-															
				round information	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 243	5.00	5.00	4.12	4.61	5.00
3. Were no	ecessary	materials avail	lable fo	or lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 212	5.00	5.00	4.40	4.73	5.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	ype			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 0	A 2		 Red	 miir	 ed f	or Ma	iore	 !	0	Graduat		1	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1		1,00	2411	JU II	O1 140	. ,	,	J	Graduat	_	_	1.10. ) (		J
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-q	rad	2	Non-	major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		061	icia.	-					onaci -g.	Luu	_	14011		5
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		El4	ectiv	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	rh
Ji da.	-	3.30 1.00	_	P 0								_	respons				_	
				I O		O+1	her					2	I CDPOIID		.c bigii	LLLCan		
				5 0		001						-						
				. 0														

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 647

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SCHAFFER, EUGEN Fall 2008
Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 17 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: EDUC 795 8720

SEM STUDY TEACHING

Title

Grad.

7

3.50-4.00

3

				Frequencies					Ins	tructor	Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect		
		Questions		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
		 General															
1. Did vo	nı gain ne	ew insights,skills f	rom this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	459/1649	4.66	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.65
		ctor make clear the		0	0	0	0	1	6		4.53	533/1648		4.38	4.23	4.34	4.53
		uestions reflect the		0	15	0	0	1	0	1		****/1375		4.54	4.27	4.44	****
		uations reflect the		0	4	0	1	1	4		4.31				4.20	4.35	
		eadings contribute t		0	1	2	0	2	5		3.94				4.04	4.28	3.94
			to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1			4.53			4.35	4.10	4.35	4.53
		g system clearly exp		0	8	2	2	0	3			1520/1623		4.34		4.29	
	-	was class cancelled		1	0	0	0	0			4.94			4.76	4.69		4.94
	_		aching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	,		4.18	4.06	4.20	4.69
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures wel	l prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	573/1568	4.35	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.71
		ctor seem interested		0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94			4.85	4.70	4.83	4.94
		terial presented and		0	0	0	0	0	4		4.76			4.48	4.28	4.41	4.76
		es contribute to wha		0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65			4.37	4.29	4.41	4.65
		l techniques enhance		0	6	1	3	1	2			1075/1352				4.10	
		Discussion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	343/1384	4.66	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.65
		nts actively encoura	_	0	0	0	0	0	3		4.82			4.73	4.29	4.52	4.82
		ctor encourage fair		0	0	0	0	1			4.88				4.30	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful					2	1	0	2	2	10	4.33					4.03	
		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 a	ssianed t	topics relevant to t	he announced theme	14	1	0	0	0	0	2	5 00	****/ 88	****	4.61	4.54	4.63	****
		ctor available for i		14	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 85		4.63	4.47	4.50	****
		rojects contribute t		14	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 81		4.47	4.43	4.43	****
		ons contribute to wh		14	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 92		4.53	4.35	4.42	****
_		for grading made cle	-	9	1	0	0	1	5	1		83/ 288				3.87	4.00
		Field Work															
1. Did fi	eld exper	rience contribute to	what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.64	4.06	4.51	****
	_	s help you carry out	-	12	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	232/ 312		3.95	3.68	3.83	3.40
		Self Paced															
1 Did co	olf-naced	system contribute t		15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5 00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.37	****
	_	tions make clear the	_	15	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30		****	4.16	4.49	****
		acts with the instru		15	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41		****	4.43	4.43	****
_			_	15	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24		****	4.42	4.67	****
	<ul><li>4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful</li><li>5. Were there enough proctors for all the students</li></ul>				1	0	0	0	0	_		****/ 110		****	3.99	3.92	****
			Freq	iencs.	n Diet	trib	utio	า									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	; 			Ту 	pe 			Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 10		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	7	Majo	or	0
	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2						_				_			_			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0		Gei	nera	T				0	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0														

Electives

0

#### - Means there are not enough

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 14 0

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: EDUC 796 8010

8

HUMAN PERF TECH

ERDMAN, CAROL B

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

Fall 2008

Page 648 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

	Ouestions				Frequencies 1 2 3			5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	Questions		NA												
	General														
1. Did you gain ne	w 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 instruc	tor 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 qu	estions 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 evalu	ations 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 re	adings 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 ass	signments 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 g	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 instru	ctor'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
	tor 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 mat	erial 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 lecture	es 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 discu	ssions 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
	its 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
	tor 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
	chniques 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	s help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.95	3.68	3.83	****
	Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned		Reasons							Тv	уре		Majors		<b>:</b>	
	Cum. GPA Expected Grades														
00-27 2	0.00-0.99 0 A 7		ке	quır	ea i	or Ma	ijors	3	0	Graduat	e	2	Majo	r	7

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected	l 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	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	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	1
				P	0		responses to be significant		gnificant		
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				2	Λ						