Course-Section: EDUC 216 0101

University of Maryland Baltimore County

FOUNDATIONS OF LEADERS

Instructor: LENNON, NICHOLA (Instr. A) Enrollment:

Title

18

Spring 2008

Page 576 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	18	
Questionnaires:	15	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eauei	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean			_		Mean	
~ 														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	6	3	3.73	1453/1670	3.73	4.48	4.31	4.32	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	6	4	3.73	1419/1666	3.73	4.45	4.27	4.27	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	868/1406	4.27	4.50	4.32	4.39	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	4	4	3.67	1380/1615	3.67	4.51	4.24	4.29	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	5	5	3.80	1108/1566	3.80	4.14	4.07	4.00	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	3	5	3.33	1368/1528	3.33	4.42	4.12	4.11	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	1235/1650	3.93	4.43	4.22	4.20	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	472/1667	4.93	4.83	4.67	4.64	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	5	6	4	3.93	1072/1626	3.97	4.27	4.11	4.06	3.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	946/1559	4.45	4.59	4.46	4.40	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	1279/1560	4.52	4.86	4.72	4.73	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	646/1549	4.58	4.53	4.31	4.25	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	949/1546	4.09	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	794/1323		4.12	4.00	4.08	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.50	4.10	4.07	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75		4.75	4.68	4.29	4.25	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	439/1378	4.75	4.75	4.31	4.26	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	194/ 904	4.63	4.34	4.03	4.01	4.63
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	3.38	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, -	****	3.21	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 230	****	3.82	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 231	****	4.10	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 218	****	3.83	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 87	****	4.68	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.43	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 75	****	4.61	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.47	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.40	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.76	4.50	2.00	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.26	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.44	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.33	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.41	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 28	****	3.57	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50		****	4.17	4.67	****	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	,	****	4.67	4.54	****	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 10	****	4.40	4.84	****	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	1	0	0	0	0	_		****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	***

Course-Section: EDUC 216 0101

FOUNDATIONS OF LEADERS

Instructor: LENNON, NICHOLA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 15

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 576 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	 7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	10	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: EDUC 216 0101

18

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County

FOUNDATIONS OF LEADERS Title

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 577 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eanei	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	6	3	3.73	1453/1670	3.73	4.48	4.31	4.32	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	6	4	3.73	1419/1666	3.73	4.45	4.27	4.27	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	868/1406	4.27	4.50	4.32	4.39	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	4	4	3.67	1380/1615	3.67	4.51	4.24	4.29	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	5	5	3.80	1108/1566	3.80	4.14	4.07	4.00	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	3	5	3.33	1368/1528	3.33	4.42	4.12	4.11	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	1235/1650	3.93	4.43	4.22	4.20	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	472/1667	4.93	4.83	4.67	4.64	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	953/1626	3.97	4.27	4.11	4.06	3.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	996/1559	4.45	4.59	4.46	4.40	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1188/1560	4.52	4.86	4.72	4.73	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	537/1549	4.58	4.53	4.31	4.25	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1244/1546	4.09	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1040/1323	3.71	4.12	4.00	4.08	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.50	4.10	4.07	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	400/1378	4.75	4.68	4.29	4.25	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	439/1378	4.75	4.75	4.31	4.26	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	194/ 904	4.63	4.34	4.03	4.01	4.63
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 232	****	3.38	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	3.21	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 230	****	3.82	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 231	****	4.10	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 218	***	3.83	4.18	4.25	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 87	****	4.68	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.43	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 75	****	4.61	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.47	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.40	3.97		****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.76	4.50	2.00	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.26	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 38	****	4.44	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.00	****/ 39	****		4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31	***		4.47	4.00	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 28	****	3.57	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 16	****	4.17	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.67	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 10	****	4.40	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: EDUC 216 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Title FOUNDATIONS OF LEADERS Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 15

AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 577

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	10	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: EDUC 310 0101

Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION

Instructor: Enrollment:

GAURIN, ADELL A

17 Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 578 Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Companies No. No. No. 1 2 0 4 5 Mean Rank Mean		Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean																	
Did you gain new insights,skills from this course		-														_			
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course			Quesciona	, 															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals			General	L															
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights,skil	lls from	m this course	0	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	737/16	70 4.12	4.48	4.31	4.24	4.45
A. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2. Did th	e instruc	tor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	1048/16	56 4.31	4.45	4.27	4.18	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned Did witten assignment contribute to what you learned Did witten assignment contribute to what you learned Did witten assignment contribute to what you learned Did witten assignment contribute to what you learned Did witten assignment contribute to what you learned Did witten assignment contribute to what you learned Did witten assignment contribute to what you learned Did witten assignment contribute to what you learned Did witten assignment contribute to what you learned Did witten assignment contribute to what you learned Did witten assignment contribute to what you learned Did class discussions contribute to what you learned Did cla	3. Did th	e exam qu	estions reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/140	06 4.50	4.50	4.32	4.22	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 4 6 4.64 395/1550 4.28 4.43 4.22 4.12 4.07 4.27 1. Was the grading system clearly explained 9. 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 4.09 14/17/1667 4.22 4.83 4.67 4.09 1. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness of the contribute to what you learned 9. 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 4.09 14/17/1667 4.22 4.83 4.67 4.09 1. Were the instructor selective well prepared 9. 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4 6 4.36 1050/1559 4.22 4.59 4.46 4.01 4.26 1. Did the instructor selective well prepared 9. 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 5 0 0 1 15 0 0 4 6 4.36 1050/1559 4.22 4.59 4.46 4.07 4.26 1. Did the instructor selective well prepared 1. Did the instructor contribute to what you learned 2. Did the lectures 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 class discussions contribute to what you learned 5. Did addiotive all techniques enhances of the property of the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6. Did the instructor encourage to participate 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 1/1378 4.83 4.75 4.11 4.20 4.09 4.39 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were special techniques successful 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful 4. Did present the successful and open discussion 5. Reminar 6. Reminar 7. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 8. Seminar 8. Were you provided with adequate background information 9. 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	953/163	L5 4.26	4.51	4.24	4.18	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 10 1 0 2 7 4.50 403/1626 4.21 4.27 4.11 4.06 4.50 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 4 6 4.36 1062/1559 4.22 4.59 4.46 4.40 4.36 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 1/1560 4.88 4.86 4.72 4.67 5.00 3. Was lecture material prepared and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 1/1560 4.88 4.86 4.72 4.67 5.00 3. Was lecture material prepared and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 1/1560 4.88 4.86 4.72 4.67 5.00 4. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 1/1560 4.88 4.86 4.72 4.67 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2 0 0 1 4 6 4.35 5634/158 4.10 4.43 4.32 4.24 4.45 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 782/1546 4.10 4.43 4.32 4.24 4.45 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 782/1546 4.10 4.43 4.32 4.24 4.45 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 782/1546 4.10 4.43 4.32 4.24 4.45 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 782/1546 4.10 4.43 4.32 4.24 4.45 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 782/1546 4.10 4.43 4.32 4.24 4.45 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 782/1546 4.10 4.43 4.30 4.03 4.03 4.03 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 5.00 1/1378 4.72 4.68 4.29 4.30 5.00 6. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 5.00 1/1378 4.72 4.68 4.29 4.30 5.00 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 1/1378 4.93 4.75 4.31 4.33 5.00 7. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 9 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 1/1378 4.93 4.75 4.31 4.33 5.00 7. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 9	5. Did as	signed re	adings contribu	ite to v	what you learned	0	0		0	3	2	5	3.91	1010/15	56 3.92	4.14	4.07	4.04	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How mould you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 4 .4.99 1477/1667 4.22 4.83 4.67 4.67 4.09 6.50 Lecture	6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contri	ibute to	o what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	688/152	28 4.17	4.42	4.12	4.07	4.27
New would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1	7. Was th	e grading.	system clearly	/ expla:	ined	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	395/16	50 4.28	4.43	4.22	4.12	4.64
Lecture Lect		_				-	-	-	-	-									
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interseted in the subject 3. Did the instructor seem interseted in the subject 3. Did the instructor seem interseted in the subject 4. Did the instructor seem interseted in the subject 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 7. Did class discussion 8. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did class discussions 1. Did class discussions 1. Did class discussions 1. Did class discussions 2. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were appecial techniques successful 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 5.00 1/1378 4.72 4.68 4.03 4.03 4.03 4.05 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00	9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overal	ll teach	ning effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	403/162	26 4.21	4.27	4.11	4.06	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 11 5.00 1/1506 4.88 4.86 4.72 4.67 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 6 4.45 78/1506 4.10 4.13 4.25 4.31 4.25 4.55 5. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 782/1506 4.10 4.13 4.20 4.00 3.99 4.33 Discussion Discussion Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 00 11/1378 4.88 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.12 4.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 11/1378 4.81 4.75 4.31 4.33 5.00 4. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 11/1378 4.83 4.75 4.31 4.33 5.00 4. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 11/1378 4.83 4.75 4.31 4.33 5.00 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 5.00 11/1378 4.83 4.75 4.31 4.33 5.00 3. Did the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00			Lecture	9															
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 3 7 4.55 634/1549 4.36 4.53 4.31 4.25 4.55 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 1 3 7 4.55 634/1549 4.36 4.53 4.31 4.25 4.55 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2 0 0 0 1 4 4 6 4.45 782/1546 4.10 4.43 3.32 4.24 4.45 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2 0 0 0 1 4 4 4 4.33 481/1323 3.78 4.12 4.00 3.99 4.33 Discussion	1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures	s well p	prepared	0	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	1062/15	59 4.22	4.59	4.46	4.40	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4 6 4.45 782/1546 4.10 4.43 4.32 4.24 4.45 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2 0 0 1 4 4 6 4.43 782/1546 4.10 4.43 4.12 4.00 3.99 4.33 Discussion Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 2 2 6 4.40 541/1384 4.48 4.50 4.10 4.12 4.40 5.00 3.00 3.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1	2. Did th	e instruc	tor seem intere	ested in	n the subject	0	-	0	0	0	0			1/15	50 4.88	4.86	4.72	4.67	5.00
Discussion																			
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 2 2 6 4.40 541/1384 4.48 4.50 4.10 4.12 4.40 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1378 4.72 4.68 4.29 4.30 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1378 4.73 4.68 4.29 4.30 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 179/904 4.17 4.34 4.03 4.03 4.07 4.67 Were special techniques successful 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 1/1378 4.83 4.75 4.31 4.33 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 1/1378 4.63 4.75 4.31 4.33 5.00 4.67 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 239 **** 3.21 4.21 3.99 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 9 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 87 **** 4.68 4.65 4.30 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.48 4.64 4.53 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.61 4.57 4.50 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.61 4.57 4.50 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 9 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.44 4.45 3.68 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 2 9 4.82 24/ 41 4.78 4.76 4.50 4.44 4.82 2.01 dyou clearly understand your evaluation criteria 0 0 0 3 2 1 5 3.73 30/ 38 4.05 4.26 4.19 3.96 3.73 3.73 3.73 30/ 38 4.03 4.04 4.49 4.82 2.01 dyou clearly understand your evaluations 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 23/ 31 4.14 4.74 4.41 4.47 4.51 4.29 5.01 dyou clearly understand your evaluations 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 23/ 31 4.14 4.74 4.47 4.45 4.38 4.29 5.01 dyou clearly understand your evaluations 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 23/ 31 4.14 4.74 4.47 4.51 4.29 5.01 4.29 5.01 dyou clearly understand your evaluations 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 23/ 31 4.14 4.78 4.74 4.45 4.78 4.78 4.78 4.78 4.78 4.78 4.78 4.78				_	-	0				_	4	6	4.45	782/15	4.10	4.43	4.32	4.24	4.45
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 2 2 6 4.40 541/1384 4.48 4.50 4.10 4.12 4.40 2. Were all students actively encouraged fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1378 4.72 4.68 4.29 4.30 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1378 4.83 4.75 4.31 4.33 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 5.00 1/1378 4.83 4.75 4.31 4.33 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 5.00 1/1378 4.83 4.75 4.31 4.33 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 1/179 904 4.17 4.34 4.03 4.03 4.05 4.06 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07	5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enl	nance yo	our understanding	0	2	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	481/132	23 3.78	4.12	4.00	3.99	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1378 4.72 4.68 4.29 4.30 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1378 4.72 4.68 4.29 4.31 4.33 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 179/904 4.17 4.34 4.03 4.03 4.67 Laboratory Laborat			Discuss	sion															
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 5.00 1/1378 4.83 4.75 4.31 4.33 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 7 4.67 179/904 4.17 4.34 4.03 4.03 4.67 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 239 **** 3.21 4.21 3.99 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme					_	1								541/138	34 4.48		4.10	4.12	
Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0						1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/13	78 4.72	4.68	4.29	4.30	5.00
Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 239 **** 3.21 4.21 3.99 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 9 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 87 **** 4.68 4.65 4.30 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.68 4.65 4.30 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 ****/ 75 **** 4.61 4.57 4.50 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.61 4.57 4.50 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 9 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.61 4.57 4.50 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.40 3.97 3.76 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 9 4.82 24/ 41 4.78 4.76 4.50 4.44 4.82 2.01 you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 0 0 0 3 2 1 5 3.73 30/ 38 4.05 4.26 4.19 3.96 3.73 3.04 you clearly understand your evaluations 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 23/ 39 4.04 4.33 4.27 4.38 4.29 5.0 Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 23/ 39 4.04 4.31 4.47 4.51 4.29 5.0 Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 23/ 39 4.04 4.31 4.47 4.51 4.29 28 5.0 Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 20/ 31 4.14 4.41 4.47 4.51 4.51 4.29 28 5.0 Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 20/ 31 4.14 4.41 4.47 4.51 4.51 4.29 28 5.5 Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 20/ 31 4.14 4.41 4.47 4.51 4.51 4.29 28 5.5 Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 20/ 31 4.14 4.41 4.47 4.51 4.51 4.29 20/ 31 4.14 4.41 4.47 4.51 4.51 4.29 20/ 31 4.14 4.41 4.47 4.51 4.51 4.29 20/ 31 4.14 4.41 4.47 4.51 4.51 4.29 20/ 31 4.14 4.41 4.41 4.47 4.51 4.51 4.29 20/ 31 4.14 4.41 4.41 4.41 4.41 4.41 4.41 4			_		d open discussion														
Seminar	4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful		1	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	179/ 90	04 4.17	4.34	4.03	4.03	4.67
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme			Laborat	cory															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 9 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 87 **** 4.68 4.65 4.30 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 79 **** 4.43 4.64 4.53 **** 4.50 dispenses to the projects contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 4.00 **** 79 **** 4.43 4.64 4.53 **** 4.50 dispenses to be significant 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2. Were y	ou provid	led with adequat	e backs	ground information	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	39 ****	3.21	4.21	3.99	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** / 79 **** 4.43 4.64 4.53 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 **** / 75 **** 4.61 4.57 4.50 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 **** / 75 **** 4.67 4.57 5.00 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 9 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** / 80 **** 4.47 4.53 5.68 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 9 4.82 24/ 41 4.78 4.76 4.50 4.44 4.82 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 0 0 0 0 3 2 1 5 3.73 30/ 38 4.05 4.26 4.19 3.96 3.73 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 0 5 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 19/ 38 4.63 4.44 4.62 4.68 4.83 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 23/ 39 4.04 4.33 4.27 4.38 4.29 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 20/ 31 4.14 4.41 4.47 4.51 4.29 Trequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 2.84 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 3 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 11 Non-major 11 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Graduate 0 Major 1																			
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 75 **** 4.61 4.57 4.50 **** 4.01 dpresentations contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.47 4.45 3.68 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 9 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.40 3.97 3.76 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 9 4.82 24/ 41 4.78 4.76 4.50 4.44 4.82 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 0 0 0 3 2 1 5 3.73 30/ 38 4.05 4.26 4.19 3.96 3.73 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 0 5 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 19/ 38 4.63 4.44 4.62 4.68 4.83 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 23/ 39 4.04 4.33 4.27 4.38 4.29 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 23/ 39 4.04 4.34 4.77 4.31 4.29 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 3 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 11 Non-major 11 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Graduate 0 Major 11 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 18 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 18 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 Responses to be significant 0 S4-150 2 S6-150		-	-											,					
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.47 4.45 3.68 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 9 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.40 3.97 3.76 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 9 4.82 24/ 41 4.78 4.76 4.50 4.44 4.82 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 0 0 0 3 2 1 5 3.73 30/ 38 4.05 4.26 4.19 3.96 3.73 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 0 5 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 19/ 38 4.63 4.44 4.62 4.68 4.83 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 23/ 39 4.04 4.33 4.27 4.38 4.29 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 20/ 31 4.14 4.41 4.47 4.51 4.29 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 0 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 11 Non-major 11 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 9 4.82 24/ 41 4.78 4.76 4.50 4.44 4.82 2.7 4.84 4.82 2.7 4.88 4.79 4.89 4.79 4.89 4.79 4.89 4.79 4.89 4.79 4.89 4.79 4.89 4.79 4.89 4.79 4.89 4.79 4.89 4.79 4.89 4.79 4.89 4.79 4.89 4.79 4.89 4.79 4.89 4.79 4.89 4.79 4.89 4.79 4.89 4.79 4.89 4.79 4.89 4.79 4.89 4.79 4.89 4.79 4.89 4.79 4.79 4.79 4.79 4.79 4.79 4.79 4.7								-			-			,					
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 9 4.82 24/ 41 4.78 4.76 4.50 4.44 4.82 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 0 0 0 0 3 2 1 5 3.73 30/ 38 4.05 4.26 4.19 3.96 3.73 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 0 5 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 19/ 38 4.63 4.44 4.62 4.68 4.89 4.76 4.50 4.48 4.76 4.50 4.49 4.78 4.76 4.50 4.49 4.78 4.76 4.50 4.49 4.78 4.76 4.50 4.49 4.78 4.76 4.50 4.49 4.78 4.76 4.50 4.49 4.78 4.76 4.50 4.49 4.78 4.76 4.50 4.49 4.78 4.76 4.50 4.49 4.78 4.76 4.50 4.49 4.78 4.76 4.50 4.49 4.78 4.78 4.76 4.50 4.49 4.78 4.78 4.76 4.50 4.49 4.82 4.78 4.78 4.78 4.78 4.78 4.78 4.78 4.78		_	-		_		-	-	-	_	-	_		,	-				
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 9 4.82 24/ 41 4.78 4.76 4.50 4.44 4.82 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 0 0 0 3 2 1 5 3.73 30/ 38 4.05 4.26 4.19 3.96 3.73 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 0 5 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 19/ 38 4.63 4.44 4.62 4.68 4.83 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 23/ 39 4.04 4.33 4.27 4.38 4.29 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 20/ 31 4.14 4.41 4.47 4.51 4.29 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 11 Non-major 11 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	_				you learned														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 9 4.82 24/ 41 4.78 4.76 4.50 4.44 4.82 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 0 0 0 3 2 1 5 3.73 30/ 38 4.05 4.26 4.19 3.96 3.73 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 0 5 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 19/ 38 4.63 4.44 4.62 4.68 4.83 4.76 4.76 4.50 4.49 3.96 3.73 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 0 5 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 19/ 38 4.63 4.44 4.62 4.68 4.83 4.76 4.50 4.89 4.83 4.77 4.26 4.19 3.96 3.73 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 0 5 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 19/ 38 4.63 4.44 4.62 4.68 4.83 4.77 4.38 4.29 5. Did conferences help you discuss your evaluations 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 23/ 31 4.14 4.41 4.47 4.51 4.29 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 20/ 31 4.14 4.41 4.47 4.51 4.29 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 20/ 31 4.14 4.41 4.47 4.51 4.29 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 20/ 31 4.14 4.41 4.47 4.51 4.29 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 20/ 31 4.14 4.41 4.47 4.51 4.29 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 20/ 31 4.14 4.41 4.47 4.51 4.29 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 20/ 31 4.14 4.41 4.47 4.51 4.29 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 20/ 31 4.14 4.41 4.47 4.51 4.29 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 20/ 31 4.14 4.41 4.47 4.51 4.29 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 20/ 31 4.14 4.41 4.47 4.51 4.29 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 20/ 31 4.14 4.29 20/ 31 4.14 4.41 4.47 4.51 4.29 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 20/ 31 4.14 4.29 20/ 31 4.14 4.41 4.47 4.51 4.29 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 20/ 31 4.14 4.41 4.47 4.51 4.29 5. Did conferences help you carry	5. Were c	riteria f	or grading made	e clear		9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	30 ****	4.40	3.97	3.76	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 0 0 0 0 3 2 1 5 3.73 30/ 38 4.05 4.26 4.19 3.96 3.73 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 0 5 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 19/ 38 4.63 4.44 4.62 4.68 4.83 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 23/ 39 4.04 4.33 4.27 4.38 4.29 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 20/ 31 4.14 4.41 4.47 4.51 4.29 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 11 Non-major 11 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Graduate 0 William F 0 Electives 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant 1 0 Other 8																			
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 0 5 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 19/ 38 4.63 4.44 4.62 4.68 4.83 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 23/ 39 4.04 4.33 4.27 4.38 4.29 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 20/ 31 4.14 4.41 4.47 4.51 4.29 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 11 Non-major 11 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		_			_														
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 23/ 39 4.04 4.33 4.27 4.38 4.29 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 20/ 31 4.14 4.41 4.47 4.51 4.29 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 5 General 0 Under-grad 11 Non-major 11 84-150 2 3.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 11 Non-major 11 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	_	_	_																
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 4 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 20/ 31 4.14 4.41 4.47 4.51 4.29 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 11 Non-major 11 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant						-													
Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 11 Non-major 11 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 8		-	-	_															
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 Required for Majors 0 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 Under-grad 11 Non-major	5. Did co	nierences	help you carry	out fi	ield activities	0	4	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	20/	31 4.14	4.41	4.47	4.51	4.29
00-27					Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	1									
28-55	Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			-	Гуре			Majors	\$
28-55	00-27	0	0 00-0 99		 Д Б		Pe		 ed fø	 or M	 a ior		0	Gradus	 ate	0	 Ма i	 nr	n
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 I 0 Other 8		-		-	В 3		I.e.	datt.	cu i	×± 141	10ر م	J	-	Gradu		U	ria J	-	U
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 8							Ge	nera	1				0	Under-	-grad	11	Non-	-major	11
I 0 Other 8							El	ectiv	ves				0	####	- Means	there a	are not	enoug	ιh
														respon	nses to	be sigr	nificar	nt	
? 0							Ot:	her					8						
					? 0														

Course-Section: EDUC 310 0201

CCIOII: EDUC 310 0201

Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION

Instructor: DANNA, S
Enrollment: 18

Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 579 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eanei	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	2	3	6	3.79	1425/1670	4.12	4.48	4.31	4.24	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	751/1666	4.31	4.45	4.27	4.18	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	597/1406	4.50	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	775/1615		4.51		4.18	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	1	8	3.93	978/1566	3.92	4.14	4.07	4.04	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	2	7	4.07	,	4.17	4.42	4.12	4.07	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	3	2			1249/1650		4.43	4.22	4.12	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9			1295/1667		4.83	4.67	4.67	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	5	5	4	3.93	1089/1626	4.21	4.27	4.11	4.06	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	1260/1559	4.22	4.59	4.46	4.40	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	948/1560	4.88	4.86	4.72	4.67	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	2	0	8		1053/1549	4.36	4.53	4.31	4.25	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	0	1	-		1293/1546		4.43		4.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	6	1	1		1135/1323		4.12	4.00	3.99	
1														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	403/1384	4.48	4.50	4.10	4.12	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	672/1378	4.72	4.68	4.29	4.30	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	531/1378	4.83	4.75	4.31	4.33	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	671/ 904	4.17	4.34	4.03	4.03	3.67
Laboratory														
Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 239	****	2 21	4.21	2 00	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	U	U	U	U		U	4.00	/ 239		3.21	4.21	3.99	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	4.68	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.43	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	4.61	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.47	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.40	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	28/ 41	4.78	4.76	4.50	4.44	4.75
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.75	22/ 38	4.76	4.76	4.19	3.96	4.75
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	1	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	29/ 38		4.44	4.19	4.68	4.30
	6	3	0	0	2	2	1		31/ 39					
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	3 4	0	0	2	0	2		21/ 31		4.33	$4.27 \\ 4.47$	4.38 4.51	3.80
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	4	U	U	2	U	2	4.00	21/ 31	4.14	4.41	4.4/	4.51	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	3.57	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	4.17	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	4.67	4.54	2.63	****

Course-Section: EDUC 310 0201

Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION

Instructor: DANNA, S

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 579 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 311 0101 University of Maryland Page 580 Title PSYC FOUNDATION OF EDU Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI Spring 2008

I

0

0

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 12

Student	Courge	Fvaluation	Ouestionnaire
Scudent	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

					Frequencies								tructor	Course	_			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights, ski		m this course	3	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	1150/1670	4.39	4.48	4.31	4.24	4.11
		ctor make clear			3	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	719/1666	4.59	4.45	4.27	4.18	4.44
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	3	7	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1406	4.38	4.50	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	3	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	910/1615	4.58	4.51	4.24	4.18	4.22
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	1	1	0	2	5	4.00	851/1566	4.33	4.14	4.07	4.04	4.00
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	733/1528	4.54	4.42	4.12	4.07	4.22
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearly	y expla	ined	3	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	1067/1650	4.49	4.43	4.22	4.12	4.11
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1022/1667	4.49	4.83	4.67	4.67	4.67
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	hing effectiveness	4	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	953/1626	4.29	4.27	4.11	4.06	4.00	
		Lectur																
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	prepared	4	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	1052/1559	4.65	4.59	4.46	4.40	4.38	
2. Did th	ne instru	n the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	948/1560	4.84	4.86	4.72	4.67	4.75		
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	366/1549	4.84	4.53	4.31	4.25	4.75
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	4	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	987/1546	4.55	4.43	4.32	4.24	4.25
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	4	1	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	857/1323	4.43	4.12	4.00	3.99	3.86
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	390/1384	4.72	4.50	4.10	4.12	4.57
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	441/1378	4.73	4.68	4.29	4.30	4.71
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1378	4.94	4.75	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful		5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	214/ 904	4.66	4.34	4.03	4.03	4.57
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits E	Tarned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re:	asons	2			Ту	ne			Majors	
										- 								
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В 1				_				_	_	_	_			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera	Τ				0	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		_						_						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	

Other

8

Course-Section: EDUC 311 0201 University of Maryland Page 581 Title PSYC FOUNDATION OF EDU Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Quantiena						Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	479/1670	4.39	4.48	4.31	4.24	4.67
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	333/1666	4.59	4.45	4.27	4.18	4.73
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	7	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	751/1406	4.38	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.38
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	123/1615	4.58	4.51	4.24	4.18	4.93
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	295/1566	4.33	4.14	4.07	4.04	4.67
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	141/1528	4.54	4.42	4.12	4.07	4.87
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	187/1650	4.49	4.43	4.22	4.12	4.87
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		2	0	1	0	0	5	7	4.31	1334/1667	4.49	4.83	4.67	4.67	4.31
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	339/1626	4.29	4.27	4.11	4.06	4.58
		Lectur	e															
1. Were the	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	221/1559	4.65	4.59	4.46	4.40	4.92
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	477/1560	4.84	4.86	4.72	4.67	4.92
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	161/1549	4.84	4.53	4.31	4.25	4.92
4. Did the	id the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	299/1546	4.55	4.43	4.32	4.24	4.85
5. Did au	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understar						0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1323	4.43	4.12	4.00	3.99	5.00
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	184/1384	4.72	4.50	4.10	4.12	4.88
				ed to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	400/1378	4.73	4.68	4.29	4.30	4.75
		_		d open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	312/1378	4.94	4.75	4.31	4.33	4.88
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		7	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	146/ 904	4.66	4.34	4.03	4.03	4.75
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;	
00-27	2	 A 9		 Pe	auir		or Ma	ior		0	Graduat		0	Majo		0		
28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 1	B 1		110	dutt.	ca I	OT 1/10	٠,٠٠٠			Graduat	_		1.10)	<i>-</i>	U
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	-major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D 0		00	c.a	_				_	onder g	Luu I		14011		10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		E.I	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means +	here =	re not	enouc	rh
craa.	J	P 0								_	respons				_			
				т 0		٥+	her					7	1 CDPOID	L	.c bigi			
			1 0		UL	TICT					,							

0

I ?

Course-Section: EDUC 313 0101 University of Maryland Page 582 Title Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 PEER ASSISTED LRNING I Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: DAVIS, THERESA 8

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	996/1670	4.25	4.48	4.31	4.24	4.25
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	312/1666	4.75	4.45	4.27	4.18	4.75
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	290/1615	4.75	4.51	4.24	4.18	4.75
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.14	4.07	4.04	4.00
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	300/1528	4.67	4.42	4.12	4.07	4.67
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	361/1650	4.67	4.43	4.22	4.12	4.67
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	207/1626	4.75	4.27	4.11	4.06	4.75
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.40	5.00
		ctor seem inter		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.67	5.00	
			xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3		366/1549	4.75	4.53	4.31	4.25	4.75	
		es contribute t		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.24	5.00	
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.12	4.00	3.99	5.00
		1	_															
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.34	4.03	4.03	5.00
				Freq	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arnod	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				D.O.	ason	a			Тур	20			Majors	
										5 								, . – – – –
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 4		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajors	3	0	Graduate	2	0	Majo	r	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-gr	rad	4	Non-	major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1 3	D 0											_			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - N				_	ſh	
				P 0									response	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot]	her					2						

? 0

Course-Section: EDUC 314 0101 University of Maryl Title PEER ASSISTED LRNING I Baltimore County Instructor: DAVIS, THERESA (Instr. A) Spring 2008

Enrollment:

3

University of Maryland Page 583
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

0

responses to be significant

Ouestionnaires:	4	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
Quebeloinia il eb	1	D C a a CII C	COULDC	n varaacron	Queberonnarie

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

		Questions			NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General																
		ew insights,skil			0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	363/1670		4.48	4.31	4.24	4.75
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1666	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.18	5.00
	_	estions reflect			0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.22	5.00
		ations reflect		1 5	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.51	4.24	4.18	5.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.14	4.07	4.04	4.00
		_		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.42	4.12	4.07	4.50
		g system clearly		ined	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	272/1650	4.75	4.43	4.22	4.12	4.75
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overal	1 teac	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.27	4.11	4.06	4.50
		Lecture																
		1	-	•	•	•	0	0	_	F 00	1 /1 5 5 0	F 00	4 50	4 46	4 40	F 00		
	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.40	5.00
					1	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.67	5.00
		-		explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1549	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.25	5.00
		es contribute to			1	-				-	3		1/1546	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.24	
5. Did aud	liovisual	techniques enn	ance y	our understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	692/1323	4.50	4.12	4.00	3.99	4.50
		Discuss	ion															
1 Did ala	an dina			what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.12	5.00
				ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.30	5.00
				nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	3		439/1378	4.75	4.75	4.31	4.33	4.75
		chniques succes		d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 904		4.34		4.03	5.00
i. Were be	peciai ec	ciniiques succes	BLUI		U	O	U	U	O	U	-	3.00	1/ 501	3.00	1.51	1.05	1.05	3.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3			Туј	ne .			Majors	
					es Reasons									,				. – – – –
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors					5	0	Graduate	9	0	Majo	r	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General					2	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	4		
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0							_			_				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives						2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh	

Other

Course-Section: EDUC 314 0101 University of Maryland PEER ASSISTED LRNING I Baltimore County

Page 584 AUG 6, 2008 Title Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029 Instructor:
Enrollment: (Instr. B)

Enrollment:	3		
Questionnaires:	4	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	re

	Frequencies												_	
				_		5	_		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	363/1670	4.75	4.48	4.31	4.24	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.51	4.24	4.18	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.14	4.07	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0 E	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.42	4.12	4.07	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	272/1650	4.75	4.43	4.22	4.12	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	4.50	4.12	4.00	3.99	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1384		4.50	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0		0	0	0	0	4		1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	439/1378	4.75	4.75	4.31	4.33	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.34	4.03	4.03	5.00
Fre	quenc	y Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	3			Re	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0														
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 0	General					2	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	4		
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0														

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

Course-Section: EDUC 387 0101 University of Maryland Title TUTORING AND LITERACY Baltimore County Spring 2008

Instructor: TAYLOR, JOBY B (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 1 Questionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 585

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies						Tng	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2 2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	300/1670	4.80	4.48	4.31	4.24	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	312/1666	4.75	4.45	4.27	4.18	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.51	4.24	4.18	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	389/1566	4.50	4.14	4.07	4.04	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	706/1528	4.25	4.42	4.12	4.07	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.43	4.22	4.12	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1559	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1549	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1546	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.24	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	608/1384	4.33	4.50	4.10	4.12	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	797/1378	4.33	4.68	4.29	4.30	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	531/1378	4.67	4.75	4.31	4.33	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	328/ 904	4.33	4.34	4.03	4.03	4.33
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	1									

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

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

(Instr. B) Spring 2008 Instructor:

Enroll	nent:	1
Onogtic		

56-83

Grad.

84-150

0

1

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

1

3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Questionnaires: 5

С

D

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

0

0

0

						Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 al															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	ills fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	300/1670	4.80	4.48	4.31	4.24	4.80
_	_	ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	312/1666	4.75	4.45	4.27	4.18	4.75
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	ct the	expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.67
		uations reflect			1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.51	4.24	4.18	5.00
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	oute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	389/1566	4.50	4.14	4.07	4.04	4.50
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ribute	to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	706/1528	4.25	4.42	4.12	4.07	4.25
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	ly expl	ained	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.43	4.22	4.12	5.00
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	celled		1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	all tea	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.27	4.11	4.06	4.50
		Lectur	re															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	es well	prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did th	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	ed and	explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	to what	you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.24	5.00
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques er	nhance	your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	326/1323	4.50	4.12	4.00	3.99	4.50
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	608/1384	4.33	4.50	4.10	4.12	4.33
2. Were a	ıll stude	nts actively er	ncourag	ed to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	797/1378	4.33	4.68	4.29	4.30	4.33
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	531/1378	4.67	4.75	4.31	4.33	4.67
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	essful		2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	328/ 904	4.33	4.34	4.03	4.03	4.33
	Freq	uency	y Dis	trib	utio	n												
Credita E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Pa	ason	-			Ту	ne			Majors	
CLEGICS E				Expedied Grades	, 					> 			ту.	 he				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99		A 4	Required for Majors					0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0		
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 0	Gamana 3						0	TT1	,	_			-	

General

Other

Electives

2

1

Under-grad

5

responses to be significant

- Means there are not enough

Non-major 5

Page 586 AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: EDUC 388 0101 University of Maryland AUG 6, 2008 Title INCLUSION & INSTRUCTIO Baltimore County Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: DANNA, S Enrollment: 20

4. Were special techniques successful

Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 587

													_	
			Fre	_	ncie	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	1/1670	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.24	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.51	4.24	4.18	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.14	4.07	4.04	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.42	4.12	4.07	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.43	4.22	4.12	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	861/1667	4.80	4.83	4.67	4.67	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	324/1626	4.60	4.27	4.11	4.06	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	626/1323	4.14	4.12	4.00	3.99	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.33	5.00
3 1														

Frequency Distribution

 $1 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 4 \quad 4.33 \quad 328/ \ 904 \quad 4.33 \quad 4.34 \quad 4.03 \quad 4.03 \quad 4.33$

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	6	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		Under-grad	7	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there a	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other		-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 410 0101

READ CONTNT AREA I

Title Instructor: NORTH-COLEMAN,

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Spring 2008

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 588 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

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	0	0	0	4	3	5	6	3.72	1458/1670	3.72	4.48	4.31	4.45	3.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	1003/1666	4.22	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.50	4.32	4.48	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	898/1615	4.24	4.51	4.24	4.37	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	6	6	3.83	1078/1566	3.83	4.14	4.07	4.17	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	6	7	4.11	832/1528	4.11	4.42	4.12	4.26	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	3	9		1067/1650	4.11	4.43	4.22	4.28	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	5	5	6	4.06	921/1626	4.06	4.27	4.11	4.28	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	607/1559	4.71	4.59	4.46	4.58	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	12		1042/1560	4.71	4.86	4.72	4.80	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7		4.35	876/1549	4.35	4.53	4.31		4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	6	8		1048/1546	4.18	4.43	4.32		4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	315/1323	4.53	4.12	4.00	4.10	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.50	4.10	4.32	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	400/1378	4.75	4.68	4.29	4.55	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	375/1378	4.82	4.75	4.31		4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	179/ 904	4.67	4.34	4.03	4.22	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	3.38	4.19	4.35	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 239	****	3.21	4.21	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 230	****	3.82	4.44	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	3.83	4.18	4.09	****
Seminar				_	_									
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 87	****	4.68	4.65	4.80	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.43	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 75	****	4.61	4.57	4.56	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	U	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80		4.40	3.97	3.67	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	4.76	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 38	****	4.26	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 38	****	4.44	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	4.33	4.27	4.02	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.41	4.47	4.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	3.57	4.64	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.17	4.67	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.67	4.54	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	4.40	4.84	***	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: EDUC 410 0101
Title READ CONTNT AREA I

Instructor: NORTH-COLEMAN,
Enrollment: 28

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 588 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 412 0101 University of Mar Title ANALYSIS OF TCHNG & LR Baltimore Coun Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI Spring 2008

University of Maryland Page 589
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	27	
Questionnaires:	25	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questi en e							_	ncies				ructor		_		Level		
		Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	n this course	15	0	1	0	1	0	8	4.40	809/1670	4.51	4.48	4.31	4.45	4.40
_	_	ctor make clear			15	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	490/1666	4.61	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.60
		estions reflec	_	_	15	5	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1406	4.60	4.50	4.32	4.48	****
	_	ations reflect		_	15	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	687/1615	4.47	4.51	4.24	4.37	4.40
				what you learned	15	0	2	0	2	1	5	3.70	1181/1566		4.14	4.07	4.17	3.70
				what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	662/1528	4.38	4.42	4.12	4.26	4.30
		g system clearl			15	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	327/1650	4.31	4.43	4.22	4.28	4.70
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		15	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	992/1667	4.85	4.83	4.67	4.73	4.70
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teacl	ning effectiveness	17	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	728/1626	4.38	4.27	4.11	4.28	4.25
	Lecture																	
1. Were th	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1559	4.78	4.59	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	725/1560	4.76	4.86	4.72	4.80	4.86
3. Was le	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	248/1549	4.76	4.53	4.31	4.43	4.86
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	what	you learned	18	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	822/1546	4.55	4.43	4.32	4.43	4.43
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	nance yo	our understanding	18	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	288/1323	4.23	4.12	4.00	4.10	4.57
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to v	what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1384		4.50	4.10	4.32	****
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	19	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1378	4.86	4.68	4.29	4.55	****
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair and	d open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	0	6		****/1378			4.31	4.60	****
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		19	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/ 904	4.83	4.34	4.03	4.22	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 8					Red	 guire	ed f	or Ma	iors		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55							_									5		
56-83						Ger	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 2	25	Non-	-major	25
84-150	84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0												3				-	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0						Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	rh
P 0													respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
I 0					Oth	ner					9	-		3				
	I 0																	

Course-Section: EDUC 412 0201 University of Maryland

I

?

0

0

Title Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 ANALYSIS OF TCHNG & LR Spring 2008 Instructor: SINGER, JONATHA Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 13

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Page 590

						Fr	eque	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera:	 L															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	544/1670	4.51	4.48	4.31	4.45	4.62
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	477/1666	4.61	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.62
3. Did th	e exam qu	uestions reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	8	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	495/1406	4.60	4.50	4.32	4.48	4.60
4. Did ot	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	520/1615	4.47	4.51	4.24	4.37	4.54
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	851/1566	3.85	4.14	4.07	4.17	4.00
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	476/1528	4.38	4.42	4.12	4.26	4.46
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly	z expla	ined	0	0	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	1249/1650	4.31	4.43	4.22	4.28	3.92
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1667	4.85	4.83	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How wo	. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiven							0	0	5	5	4.50	403/1626	4.38	4.27	4.11	4.28	4.50
1. Were t	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	0	4	5	4.56	834/1559	4.78	4.59	4.46	4.58	4.56
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1090/1560		4.86	4.72	4.80	4.67
				explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	488/1549	4.76	4.53	4.31	4.43	4.67
		es contribute to			4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	520/1546	4.55	4.43	4.32	4.43	4.67
				our understanding	4	0	1	0	0	6	2	3.89	834/1323	4.23	4.12	4.00	4.10	3.89
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.32	5.00
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	295/1378		4.68	4.29	4.55	4.86
				d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	333/1378		4.75	4.31	4.60	4.86
		echniques succes		01	6	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	123/ 904		4.34	4.03	4.22	4.83
				Frequ	ency	, Dis	trib	utio	n									
	_	.01107	210	0112	u010.													
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	asons	; 			Ту	pe 			Majors	
00-27							quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General						0	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	-major	13	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	h
	P 0												respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
		_								_								

Other

7

Course-Section: EDUC 416 0101 Title MATERIALS TCH READ Instructor: YOUNG, PATRICIA 10

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 591 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

	Questions						1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1116/1670	4.14	4.48	4.31	4.45	4.14
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.50
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.50	4.32	4.48	4.67
4. Did oth	ner evalı	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	724/1615	4.38	4.51	4.24	4.37	4.38
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	520/1566	4.38	4.14	4.07	4.17	4.38
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.42	4.12	4.26	4.00
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	570/1650	4.50	4.43	4.22	4.28	4.50
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1347/1626	3.60	4.27	4.11	4.28	3.60
		Lectur	0															
1 Were th	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	Ο	0	7	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.58	5.00
					1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	725/1560	4.86	4.86	4.72	4.80	4.86
	 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearl 						0	0	0	2	5	4.71	424/1549	4.71	4.53	4.31	4.43	4.71
		es contribute t			1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	631/1546	4.57	4.43	4.32	4.43	4.57
				our understanding	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	326/1323	4.50	4.12	4.00	4.10	4.50
		1	2															
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	541/1384	4.40	4.50	4.10	4.32	4.40
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	348/1378	4.80	4.68	4.29	4.55	4.80
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	899/1378	4.20	4.75	4.31	4.60	4.20
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	405/ 904	4.20	4.34	4.03	4.22	4.20
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad								Rea	ason	s 			Тур	e 			Majors	:
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5					Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajors	3	0	Graduate	3	0	Majo	r	0
28-55																		
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 1						Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-gr	rad	8	Non-	major	8
84-150	84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0																	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### - M				_	ıh
				P 0									response	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				_		_												

Other

7

I

0

0

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

> ? 0

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

1

Page 592 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

	Ouestionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

								eque.	LICIC.	_		1110	Laccor	COULDC	. DCPC	OFIDC	TCACT	DCCC
	Questions				NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u qain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.45	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.35	5.00
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.48	5.00
4. Did oth	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.51	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did ass	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.14	4.07	4.17	5.00
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.42	4.12	4.26	5.00
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.43	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.27	4.11	4.28	5.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.58	5.00
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	1		1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.80	5.00
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	0	1		1/1549	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.43	5.00
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	1	0		1139/1546		4.43	4.32	4.43	4.00
				our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1323			4.00	4.10	
		1											,					
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were a	ll stude:	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial t	echniques succe	ssful		0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 904	5.00	4.34	4.03	4.22	5.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
								_					_					
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	5 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	Required for Majors 0					0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1													
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General C				0	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	-major	1			
84-150	0																	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0					El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	: enoug	γh	
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot:	her					1						

Course-Section: EDUC 418 0101 University of Maryland Page 593 Title INSTRUCTION OF READING Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Spring 2008 Instructor: SHELTON, NANCY

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 6

G 1 1 1	~		
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

					Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	Genera	 1															
u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.45	5.00
e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	233/1666	4.83	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.83
e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.48	5.00
her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.51	4.24	4.37	4.50
signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	170/1566	4.83	4.14	4.07	4.17	4.83
itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1528	4.83	4.42	4.12	4.26	4.83
e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	1008/1650	4.17	4.43	4.22	4.28	4.17
ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	805/1667	4.83	4.83	4.67	4.73	4.83
uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	728/1626	4.25	4.27	4.11	4.28	4.25
	Lectur	e															
he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	521/1559	4.75	4.59	4.46	4.58	4.75
Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.80	5.00
. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly							0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.43	5.00
Did the lectures contribute to what you learned							0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.43	5.00
			-	2	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	960/1323	3.67	4.12	4.00	4.10	3.67
	Discus	sion															
ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.32	5.00
ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.55	5.00
				3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	531/1378	4.67	4.75	4.31	4.60	4.67
			-	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.34	4.03	4.22	5.00
			Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons				Tν	ne			Maiors	:
				s Reasons													
ŭ		-	A 4	Required for Majors 0				0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0			
-		-									_	_	_	_			_
_		_	0 0	General			L				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	-major	6
_			2 0								_			_			
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0					El	ecti	ves				0					_	ſh
												respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
			I 0		Ot1	her					5						
e e le c e c e le	e instructive exam quer evalusigned ritten as e grading and instructive material examples discussions	General gain new insights, ski instructor make clear exam questions reflect signed readings contribute assignments contribute assignments canculd you grade the overal lecture instructor's lecture instructor seem intercture material presente electures contribute thiovisual techniques en Discus ass discussions contribute thiovisual techniques en electure instructor encourage electures contribute thiovisual techniques en discussions contributed instructor encourage electures contributed actively ence instructor encourage electures contributed actively ence instructor encourage electures contributed ence instructor encourage electures actively ence electures contributed ence instructor encourage electures electures actively ence electures electures actively ence electures electures contributed ence electures contributed enc	e instructor make clear the executations reflect the executation of the executation o	General I gain new insights, skills from this course instructor make clear the expected goals is exam questions reflect the expected goals is exam questions reflect the expected goals is greadings contribute to what you learned itten assignments contribute to what you learned itten assignments contribute to what you learned is grading system clearly explained iny times was class cancelled and you grade the overall teaching effectiveness Lecture The instructor's lectures well prepared is instructor seem interested in the subject between material presented and explained clearly is lectures contribute to what you learned diovisual techniques enhance your understanding Discussion This is a subject to the subject of t	General In gain new insights, skills from this course In gain new instructor expected goals In grading system clearly expected goals In grading system clearly expected grades In gain new instructor expected goals In gain new instruct	General in gain new insights, skills from this course in gain new insights, skills from this course is instructor make clear the expected goals is exam questions reflect the expected goals is gain new insights, skills from this course is exam questions reflect the expected goals is exam questions exhibite to what you learned is exam questions reflect the expected goals is exampled to example the subject is exampled the subject is exampled the subject is exampled to example the subject is exampled the subject in the sub	Questions NR NA 1 NR NA 1	Questions	Questions	General a gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 be instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 be exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 4 0 0 0 0 0 be exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 4 0 0 0 0 0 be exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 be gradings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 be grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 be grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 be grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 be grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 be grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 be grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 be grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 Lecture The instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 be instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 be instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Butture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Bill students contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Bill students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 Bill students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 Bill students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 Bill students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 Bill students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 Bill students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 Bill students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 Bill students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 Bill students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 Bill students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 Bill students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 Bill students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 Bill students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 Bill students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Bill students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Bill students actively encouraged to par	Questions						

? 0 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires: 4

4

Page 594 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

	-					Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	665/1670	4.15	4.48	4.31	4.45	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	622/1666	3.67	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	290/1615	4.29	4.51	4.24	4.37	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	851/1566	3.42	4.14	4.07	4.17	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	899/1528	3.92	4.42	4.12	4.26	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1404/1650	3.75	4.43	4.22	4.28	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1022/1667	4.75	4.83	4.67	4.73	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	278/1626	4.08	4.27	4.11	4.28	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	4.42	4.59	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560		4.86	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	488/1549	4.00	4.53	4.31	4.43	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1546	4.42	4.43	4.32	4.43	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1040/1323	3.55	4.12	4.00	4.10	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	820/1384	4.20	4.50	4.10	4.32	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	400/1378		4.68	4.29	4.55	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378		4.75	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	461/ 904	4.30	4.34	4.03	4.22	4.00
Field Work														
	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1 / 41	5.00	4.76	4.50	4.98	5.00
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41 1/ 38		4.76	4.19	4.98	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	4.44	4.19	4.58	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	4.33	4.02	4.02	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.33	4.47	4.49	5.00
3. Did conferences help you carry out freta accivities	3	U	U	U	U	U		5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.41	4.4/	4.42	3.00

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Spring 2008

Enrollment: 7 Ouestionnaires: 6

Title

Instructor:

Course-Section: EDUC 419 0201

ASSESS READING

SMALL, SUE ELLE

Page 595 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			_							_				
				-	ncies		_		tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1414/1670	4.15	4.48	4.31	4.45	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	2.83	1633/1666	3.67	4.45	4.27	4.35	2.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1275/1406	3.50	4.50	4.32	4.48	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	1276/1615	4.29	4.51	4.24	4.37	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	2.83	1520/1566	3.42	4.14	4.07	4.17	2.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	1097/1528	3.92	4.42	4.12	4.26	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1314/1650	3.75	4.43	4.22	4.28	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	805/1667	4.75	4.83	4.67	4.73	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1384/1626	4.08	4.27	4.11	4.28	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1382/1559	4.42	4.59	4.46	4.58	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	0	1	3.33	1443/1549	4.00	4.53	4.31	4.43	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1260/1546	4.42	4.43	4.32	4.43	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	990/1323	3.55	4.12	4.00	4.10	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	541/1384	4.20	4.50	4.10	4.32	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	348/1378	4.78	4.68	4.29	4.55	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1378	4.90	4.75	4.31	4.60	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	202/ 904	4.30	4.34	4.03	4.22	4.60
mini di manda														
Field Work	_	0	_	0		_	-	F 00		F 00	4 56	4 50	4 00	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	T		****/ 41	5.00	4.76	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 38	5.00	4.26	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	Τ		****/ 38	5.00	4.44	4.62	4.58	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	5.00	4.33	4.27	4.02	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	Τ	0	4.00	****/ 31	5.00	4.41	4.47	4.49	****

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

Course-Section: EDUC 420 0101 University of Maryland Page 596 Title Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 TEACH MATH IN ELEM SCH Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: KINACH, BARBARA

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	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	1	1	2	4.25	996/1670	4.25	4.48	4.31	4.45	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.51	4.24	4.37	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1533/1566	2.67	4.14	4.07	4.17	2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1447/1528	3.00	4.42	4.12	4.26	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1580/1650	3.00	4.43	4.22	4.28	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1022/1667	4.67	4.83	4.67	4.73	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1491/1626	3.25	4.27	4.11	4.28	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.50	4.10	4.32	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	1193/1378	3.50	4.68	4.29	4.55	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	867/1378	4.25	4.75	4.31	4.60	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.34	4.03	4.22	4.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	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	4	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sid	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	-	•	_	
				2	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 421 0101 University of Maryland Page 597
Title TCHNG SCIENCE: ELEM SC Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 12

Spring 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

								equei		S			ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights, skil	ls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	185/1670	4.92	4.48	4.31	4.45	4.92
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	415/1666	4.67	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.67
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.48	5.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	158/1615	4.92	4.51	4.24	4.37	4.92
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	170/1566	4.83	4.14	4.07	4.17	4.83
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contri	.bute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	109/1528	4.92	4.42	4.12	4.26	4.92
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearly	expla expla	ined	0	0	0	0	3	0	9	4.50	570/1650	4.50	4.43	4.22	4.28	4.50
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	1022/1667	4.67	4.83	4.67	4.73	4.67
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overal	l teac	hing effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	231/1626	4.73	4.27	4.11	4.28	4.73
		Lecture																
1. Were t	he instr	prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.58	5.00		
2. Did th	ere the instructor's lectures well prepared .d the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.80	5.00
	d the instructor seem interested in the subject s lecture material presented and explained clea					0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1549	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute to	what	you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.43	5.00
5. Did au	ıdiovisua	l techniques enh	ance y	our understanding	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.12	4.00	4.10	5.00
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contribu	ite to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	337/1378	4.82	4.68	4.29	4.55	4.82
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage f	air an	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	281/1378	4.91	4.75	4.31	4.60	4.91
4. Were s	special t	echniques succes	sful		1	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	126/ 904	4.82	4.34	4.03	4.22	4.82
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ty	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	0	 A 10				ed f				0	Graduat		5	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1		re(4u11	eu I	OT IAIC	101	۵	U	Graduati	C	J	мајс) <u>T</u>	U
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0		GCI	iici a	_				0	onaci g.	Luu	,	14011		
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		E14	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
3244.	J	3.30 1.30	•	P 0								-	respons				_	,
															- ~-91			

Other

11

I

0

0

Course-Section: EDUC 422 0101 Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County SOCIAL STUDIES: ELEM S FITZHUGH, WILLI Spring 2008

Instructor: Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 598 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

~				~										
			Fre	equei	ncies	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Q.,,,,,,]														
General	1	0	1	1	0	2	0	1 21	042/1670	1 21	4 40	1 21	4 45	1 21
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1 1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.31	943/1670		4.48	4.31	4.45	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals			-	0	0	0	5	5.00	582/1666		4.45	4.27	4.35	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8 2	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	1/1406 176/1615		4.50	4.32	4.48	5.00 4.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	510/1566		4.51 4.14	4.24 4.07	4.37	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2			398/1528		4.14	4.12	4.17	4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2		-		417/1650		4.42	4.12	4.28	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	5		1271/1667			4.67	4.73	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	2	8		167/1626			4.11		4.80
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	J		U	U	U	2	O	1.00	107/1020	1.00	1.2/	T.11	1.20	1.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	355/1559	4.86	4.59	4.46	4.58	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	248/1549	4.86	4.53	4.31	4.43	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	288/1546	4.86	4.43	4.32	4.43	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	857/1323	3.86	4.12	4.00	4.10	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	498/1384	4.44	4.50	4.10	4.32	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	564/1378		4.68	4.29	4.55	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	621/1378			4.31	4.60	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	373/ 904		4.34	4.03		4.25
1. Were appearant deciminates addressing	3	_	Ü	Ü	-	_	-	1.25	3737 301	1.23	1.51	1.05	1.22	1.23
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232		3.38	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 239		3.21	4.21	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 230		3.82	4.44	4.30	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 231	****	4.10	4.31	4.24	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	3.83	4.18	4.09	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.68	4.65	4.80	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79		4.43	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 75		4.61	4.57	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.47	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.40	3.97	3.67	***
Field Work	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00			4 76	4 50	4 00	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41		4.76	4.50	4.98	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 38		4.26	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 38		4.44	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39		4.33	4.27	4.02	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.41	4.47	4.49	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									
				-									25-2-	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A :	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	8	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1

0 responses to be significant 0 Other 12

I

Course-Section: EDUC 439 0101 University of Maryland OBSERVATION & ASSESSME

Baltimore County

Page 599

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Title Instructor: SMALL, SUE ELLE Spring 2008

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 8 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Overtions			MD	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	5	5		tructor		Dept		Level	Sect
		Questions 	; 		NK	NA 				4 		Mean	Rank 	mean 	Mean	Mean	Mean 	Mean
		General	=															
		w insights,skil			0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	665/1670	4.50	4.48	4.31	4.45	4.50
		ctor make clear	_	-	0	0	0	0	2	3	3		1114/1666		4.45	4.27	4.35	4.13
		estions reflect			0	7	0	0	0	0	1		****/1406		4.50	4.32	4.48	****
		ations reflect	_	_	0	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	477/1615		4.51	4.24	4.37	4.57
	_	eadings contribu		-	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	643/1566		4.14	4.07	4.17	4.25
		-		what you learned	0	0	0	0 1	0 2	2	6 2	4.75	221/1528		4.42	4.12	4.26	4.75
	_	g system clearly was class cance	-	ea	0	0	0	0	0	0	2 8	5.00	1359/1650 1/1667		4.43	4.22	4.28	3.75 5.00
	-			ng effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	854/1626		4.83	4.67	4.73	4.14
9. HOW WO	uia you g	grade the overal	.i teaciii	ng effectiveness		U	U	U	1	4	۷	4.14	034/1020	9 4.14	4.2/	4.11	4.20	4.14
		Lecture																
		actor's lectures	_	_	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	896/1559		4.59	4.46	4.58	4.50
		ctor seem intere		3	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560		4.86	4.72	4.80	5.00
		erial presented			0	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	683/1549		4.53	4.31	4.43	4.50
		es contribute to			0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	570/1546		4.43	4.32	4.43	4.63
5. Did aud	diovisual	r understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	288/1323	3 4.57	4.12	4.00	4.10	4.57		
1. Did cla	ass discu	at you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	257/1384	4.75	4.50	4.10	4.32	4.75		
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively end	couraged	to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage f	air and	open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	sful		4	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	328/ 904	4.33	4.34	4.03	4.22	4.33
		Field W	Iork															
1. Did fie	eld exper	rience contribut		t vou learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.76	4.50	4.98	5.00
		understand you			5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	16/ 38	3 4.67	4.26	4.19	4.36	4.67
3. Was the	e instruc	ctor available f	or consu	ltation	5	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 38	3 5.00	4.44	4.62	4.58	5.00
4. To what	t degree	could you discu	ıss your	evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.33	4.27	4.02	5.00
5. Did com	nferences	s help you carry	out fie	ld activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.41	4.47	4.49	5.00
				Frequ	ency	, Dist	cribu	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gr							Rea	sons				T)	/pe			Majors	
00-27	0	A 3		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0		
28-55																		
56-83	1	C 0		Gei	neral	L				0	Under-	grad	8	Non-	-major	8		
84-150																		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0		Means t			_	h
				P 0									respons	ses to k	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner					3						
			? 0															

University of Maryland Course-Section: EDUC 441 0101 Title MATERIALS FOR EARLY LI

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 600

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: BELL, DEBORAH A Enrollment: 13 Qu

Questionnaires: 13 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire						
	Questionnaires:	13	Student	Course	${\tt Evaluation}$	Questionnaire

						Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	e 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, skills	rom this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	544/1670	4.62	4.48	4.31	4.45	4.62
		ctor make clear the		0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	138/1666	4.92	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.92
		uestions reflect the		0	11	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1406	****	4.50	4.32	4.48	****
		uations reflect the		0	1	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.51	4.24	4.37	5.00
		eadings contribute t	1 5	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	374/1566		4.14	4.07	4.17	4.54
	_		to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	277/1528	3 4.69	4.42	4.12	4.26	4.69
		g system clearly exp		0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1650		4.43	4.22	4.28	5.00
		was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1667	7 5.00	4.83	4.67	4.73	5.00
			eaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	499/1626	4.44	4.27	4.11	4.28	4.44
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectures wel	l prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	623/1559	4.70	4.59	4.46	4.58	4.70
		ctor seem interested		2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	829/1560		4.86	4.72	4.80	4.82
		terial presented and		2	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	525/1549		4.53	4.31	4.43	4.64
		es contribute to wha		2	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	667/1546		4.43	4.32	4.43	4.55
			your understanding	3	5	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	692/1323		4.12	4.00	4.10	4.00
1 Did al	acc dica	Discussion ussions contribute t	o what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	195/1384	4.86	4.50	4.10	4.32	4.86
		nts actively encoura		7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	316/1378		4.68	4.29	4.55	4.83
			and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	354/1378		4.75	4.31	4.60	4.83
		echniques successful	-	7	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	128/ 904		4.34	4.03	4.22	4.80
i. Were b	pecial co	cimingues buccessius	•	,	-	J	Ü	Ü	_	-	1.00	120, 50.	1.00	1.51	1.05	1.22	1.00
		Field Work															
1. Did fi	eld exper	rience contribute to	what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.76	4.50	4.98	***
2. Did yo	u clearly	y understand your e	aluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.26	4.19	4.36	***
3. Was th	e instruc	ctor available for o	onsultation	10	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.44	4.62	4.58	****
4. To wha	t degree	could you discuss y	our evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.33	4.27	4.02	***
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carry out	field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.41	4.47	4.49	****
			Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Τ̈́ς	<i>r</i> pe			Majors	\$
		·															
00-27	1	A 5		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	1	Majo	or	0	
28-55	0	В 0		_		_				_	_	_	_				
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 1		Ge	nera	Τ				0	Under-9	grad 1	12	Non-	-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		_						_						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 2	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0		Means t			_	ŋh
			P 0									respons	ses to b	oe sign	nificar	nt	
			I 0		Ot1	her					6						
			? 0														

Course-Section: EDUC 442 0101 University of Maryland Title PROCESS SEM ECE - MEDI Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: COSTELLO, MARGA

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 601

			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	1/1670	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.35	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.51	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	295/1566	4.67	4.14	4.07	4.17	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	346/1528	4.60	4.42	4.12	4.26	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.43	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	768/1667	4.86	4.83	4.67	4.73	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	531/1626	4.43	4.27	4.11	4.28	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.43	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	183/1323	4.75	4.12	4.00	4.10	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.34	4.03	4.22	5.00

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

Course-Section: EDUC 443 0101 Title

PROCESS SEM: ECE-M/S I

Instructor: BELL, DEBORAH A

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 8

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 602 Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questions						Fr 1	eque: 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General															
1. Did	vou gain		s from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.45	5.00
		uctor make clear t		0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	465/1666	4.63	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.63
			the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1235/1406	3.67	4.50	4.32	4.48	3.67
		luations reflect t		0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.51	4.24	4.37	4.50
			e to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1447/1566	3.14	4.14	4.07	4.17	3.14
6. Did	written a	ssignments contrib	ute to what you learne	d 1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	368/1528	4.57	4.42	4.12	4.26	4.57
7. Was	the gradi	ng system clearly	explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	307/1650	4.71	4.43	4.22	4.28	4.71
8. How	8. How many times was class cancelled							0	0	7	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How	would you	s 4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.27	4.11	4.28	4.50		
		Lecture			0		0										
	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	1	6	4.86	355/1559	4.86	4.59	4.46	4.58	4.86
			ted in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	5		1023/1560	4.71	4.86	4.72	4.80	4.71
			and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	,	4.71	4.53	4.31	4.43	4.71
		res contribute to		1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	631/1546	4.57	4.43	4.32	4.43	4.57
5. Did	audiovisu	al techniques enha	nce your understanding	2	3	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1259/1323	2.67	4.12	4.00	4.10	2.67
		Discussi															
			e to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	324/1384		4.50	4.10	4.32	4.67
			uraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	525/1378	4.60	4.68	4.29	4.55	4.60
		_	ir and open discussion		0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	813/1378	4.33	4.75	4.31	4.60	4.33
4. Wer	e special	techniques success	ful	2	0	0	1	0	5	0	3.67	671/ 904	3.67	4.34	4.03	4.22	3.67
1 5 1		Laborato	-	_	0	0	0	0	-	•	4 00	**** / 020	ale ale ale ale	2 20	4 10	4 25	4.4.4.4
			ing of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 232	****	3.38	4.19	4.35	****
			background information		0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 239	***	3.21	4.21	4.26	****
		-	ble for lab activities		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	3.82	4.44	4.30	****
		nstructor provide		7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 231	****	4.10	4.31	4.24	****
5. Wer	e requirem	ents for lab repor	ts clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	3.83	4.18	4.09	****
1 Mars		Seminar		7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	++++/ 07	++++	4 60	4 65	4 00	++++
	_	-	o the announced theme r individual attention	7 7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87 ****/ 79	****	4.68 4.43	4.65 4.64	4.80	****
Z. Was	the mstr	uctor available id	r individual accention	,	U	U	U	U		U	4.00	/ /9		4.43	4.04	4.00	
			Fre	quency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credit	s Earned	s			Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	5		
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4						ed f	or Ma	ajors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	1	Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 0														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0 C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	8
84-15	84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0																
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2 F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - Means there are not enough					ſh
	P 0											respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	nt	
			I 1 ? 0		Ot	her					6						

Course-Section: EDUC 447 0101 University of Maryland Title TCHNG RDG & WRITING EC Baltimore County

ROBERTS, HILARY

Instructor:

Baltimore County
Spring 2008

Page 603

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 14
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequ				eanei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Course Dept		UMBC Level		
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	Sect Mean
1 Didin i	General	+ h i	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	1 00	252/1670	1 00	4 40	1 21	4 4 5	1 00
1. Did you gain new i	9 ,		•	0	0	0	0	2	12 12	4.86	253/1670 216/1666	4.86 4.86	4.48	4.31	4.45 4.35	4.86 4.86
 Did the instructor Did the exam quest 			0	13	0	0	0		12		****/1406	4.80	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.86
4. Did other evaluati			-	1.3	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	326/1615	4.71	4.50	4.24	4.40	4.71
5. Did assigned readi	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.71	159/1566	4.71	4.14	4.24	4.37	4.71		
6. Did written assign	0	0	0	0	0	2	11		192/1528		4.14	4.12	4.17	4.79		
7. Was the grading sy	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.42	4.12	4.28	5.00		
8. How many times was		rarned	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1650		4.43		4.20	5.00
9. How would you grad	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	,		4.03		4.73			
9. How would you grad	de the Overall tea	acilling effectiveness	1	U	U	U	U	4	9	4.03	255/1020	4.09	4.4/	4.11	4.20	4.09
	Lecture															
1. Were the instructo		l prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	469/1559	4.79	4.59	4.46	4.58	4.79
2. Did the instructor			0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture materi			0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	323/1549	4.79	4.53	4.31	4.43	4.79
4. Did the lectures of	_	-	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	185/1546	4.93	4.43	4.32	4.43	4.93
5. Did audiovisual te		-	0	2	0	0	2	6		4.17	612/1323			4.00	4.10	
J. Dia addiovisual co	ciniiques cinianee	your understanding	U	2	U	U	2	O	1	1.1/	012/1323	1.1/	1.12	1.00	1.10	1.1/
	Discussion															
1. Did class discussi	ons contribute to	o what vou learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students		-	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1378		4.68	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor			1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techn	niques successful	-	1	2	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	226/ 904	4.55	4.34	4.03	4.22	4.55
-	-															
	Field Work															
1. Did field experien	ace contribute to	what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.76	4.50	4.98	5.00
2. Did you clearly un	nderstand your eva	aluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	19/ 38	4.50	4.26	4.19	4.36	4.50
3. Was the instructor	available for co	onsultation	10	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 38	****	4.44	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what degree cou	ıld you discuss yo	our evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	25/ 39	4.00	4.33	4.27	4.02	4.00
5. Did conferences he	10	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.41	4.47	4.49	****		
Frequency Distribution																
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 453 0101 University of Maryland Title ELEM INTRNSHP SEMINAR

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Instructor: BOURNE, BARBARA Enrollment: 8

Ouestionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 604

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Ouestions General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 4.38 849/1670 4.38 4.48 4.31 4.45 4.38 2 3 4.00 1199/1666 4.00 4.45 4.27 4.35 4.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 3 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 5 0 0 1 1 1 $4.00\ 1057/1406\ 4.00\ 4.50\ 4.32\ 4.48\ 4.00$ 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 1 $4.00\ 1083/1615\ 4.00\ 4.51\ 4.24\ 4.37\ 4.00$ 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 2 1 2 0 2 1 3.00 1478/1566 3.00 4.14 4.07 4.17 3.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 3 3 4.00 899/1528 0 0 1 4.00 4.42 4.12 4.26 4.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 2 1 4 4.00 1135/1650 4.00 4.43 4.22 4.28 4.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 4 4 4.50 1157/1667 4.50 4.83 4.67 4.73 4.50 4.50 4.27 4.11 4.28 4.50 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 7 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1559 **** 4.59 4.46 4.58 **** 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1560 **** 4.86 4.72 4.80 **** 7 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1549 **** 4.53 4.31 4.43 **** 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7 0 0 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1546 **** 4.43 4.32 4.43 **** Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 5 5.00 1/1384 5.00 4.50 4.10 4.32 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 525/1378 4.60 4.68 4.29 4.55 4.60 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1378 5.00 4.75 4.31 4.60 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 3 1 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 243/904 4.50 4.34 4.03 4.22 4.50 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 0 1 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 63/ 87 4.57 4.68 4.65 4.80 4.57 2 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.50 53/ 79 4.50 4.43 4.64 4.60 4.50 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 0 2 2 2 4.00 58/ 75 4.00 4.61 4.57 4.56 4.00 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 3 1 4 4.13 61/ 79 4.13 4.47 4.45 4.53 4.13 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 0 0 0 0 3 1 4 4.13 35/ 80 4.13 4.40 3.97 3.67 4.13 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/ 41 5.00 4.76 4.50 4.98 5.00 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 2 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 16/ 38 4.67 4.26 4.19 4.36 4.67 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 2 0 0 1 0 1 4 4.33 32/ 38 4.33 4.44 4.62 4.58 4.33 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 2 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 14/ 39 4.67 4.33 4.27 4.02 4.67 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 2 1 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 14/ 31 4.80 4.41 4.47 4.49 4.80 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Majors Reasons ______ 00 - 270 0.00-0.99 6 Required for Majors 0 Graduate Major A 1.00-1.99 0 В 2 28-55 0 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C Ω General 0 Under-grad Non-major 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 84-150 2 F 0 #### - Means there are not enough Grad. 3.50-4.00 4 Electives 0 P Ω responses to be significant

Other

I 0 Course-Section: EDUC 457 0101

SCNDRY INTRNSHP SEMINA

Title Instructor: OLIVA, LINDA M.

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 605 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean			Sect Mean

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	0	2	2	3.29	1593/1670	3.29	4.48	4.31	4.45	3.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	1	1	3.14	1591/1666	3.14	4.45	4.27	4.35	3.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1275/1406	3.50	4.50	4.32	4.48	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1448/1615	3.50	4.51	4.24	4.37	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1285/1566	3.50	4.14	4.07	4.17	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.42	4.12	4.26	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	1534/1650	3.29	4.43	4.22	4.28	3.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	768/1667	4.86	4.83	4.67	4.73	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.27	4.11	4.28	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1418/1559	3.71	4.59	4.46	4.58	3.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	777/1560		4.86	4.72	4.80	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1270/1549		4.53	4.31	4.43	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1361/1546	3.57	4.43	4.32	4.43	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	960/1323	3.67	4.12	4.00	4.10	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1103/1384		4.50	4.10	4.32	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	970/1378		4.68	4.29	4.55	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	590/1378		4.75	4.31	4.60	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	718/ 904	3.50	4.34	4.03	4.22	3.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	61/ 87	4.67	4.68	4.65	4.80	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	76/ 79		4.43	4.64	4.60	3.33
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	58/ 75		4.61	4.57	4.56	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	62/ 79	4.00	4.47	4.45	4.53	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	55/ 80	3.50	4.40	3.97	3.67	3.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	28/ 41	4.75	4.76	4.50	4.98	4.75
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	3	0	0	1	2.75	34/ 38	2.75	4.26	4.19	4.36	2.75
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	38/ 38		4.44	4.62	4.58	3.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	32/ 39		4.33	4.27	4.02	3.75
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	31/ 31	3.25	4.41	4.47	4.49	3.25
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	atio	n									

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

Course-Section: EDUC 601 0101 University of Maryland Page 606 Title Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 HUMAN LEARNING/COGNITI Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: OLIVA, LINDA M.

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								Frequencies					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 ne	ew insights,skil	lls fro	m this cours	se	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	557/1670	4.60	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.60
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	3	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.00
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflect	the e	expected goal	ls	3	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	597/1406	4.50	4.50	4.32	4.36	4.50
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	3	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	446/1615	4.60	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.60
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you lea	arned	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.00
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contri	ibute t	o what you	learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	173/1528	4.80	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained							0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled							0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness							0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.00
		Lecture	<u> </u>																
1. Were t	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	1199/1559	4.20	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.20
		ctor seem intere			et.	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	855/1560	4.80	4.86	4.72	4.81	4.80
		terial presented				3	0	0	1	1	1	2		1285/1549	3.80	4.53	4.31	4.37	3.80
		es contribute to		-	Jul 17	3	0	0	1	1	1	2		1273/1546	3.80	4.43	4.32	4.40	3.80
		l techniques enh		-	anding	3	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	990/1323	3.60	4.12	4.00	4.03	3.60
		Discuss	gion																
1 Did cl	ace dieci	ussions contribu		what you le	arned	5	0	0	2	0	1	Ω	2 67	1323/1384	2.67	4.50	4.10	4.21	2.67
		nts actively end		_		5	0	0	1	1	0	1		1247/1378	3.33	4.68	4.29	4.42	3.33
		ctor encourage f				5	0	0	0	2	0	1		1147/1378	3.67	4.75	4.31	4.51	3.67
		echniques succes		ia open arbei	2551011	5	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.00
					Frequ	iencv	, Dist	trib	ıt i oı	า									
					11090		210	C		-									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades								Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	i
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	Α	5		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	 3	0	Graduat	 е	2	Majo	 or	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0	0													

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

Course-Section: EDUC 602 0101 University of Maryland Title INSTRUCTIONAL SYS DEV Baltimore County Spring 2008

Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 607

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	Λ	Λ	Λ	Λ	1	5.00	1/1670	4.83	4.48	4.31	4.46	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	851/1566		4.14	4.07	4.20	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1528		4.42	4.12	4.33	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650		4.43	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626		4.27	4.11	4.20	4.33
J. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	O	O	O	O	U	U	_	3.00	1/1020	1.10	1.27	1.11	1.20	1.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	4.70	4.59	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	4.80	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	4.60	4.53	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	4.70	4.43	4.32	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	4.13	4.12	4.00	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	820/1384		4.50	4.10	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	970/1378		4.68	4.29	4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378		4.75	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	820/ 904	3.46	4.34	4.03	4.04	3.00
Frequ	iency	Dist	crib	utio	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	L	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	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	1	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 602 0101 University of Maryland Page 608 Title INSTRUCTIONAL SYS DEV Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 1

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	1	5.00	1/1670	4.83	4.48	4.31	4.46	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	851/1566	3.96	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	4.88	4.42	4.12	4.33	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	4.83	4.43	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	953/1626	4.40	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	820/1384	4.17	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	970/1378	4.21	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	4.96	4.75	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	820/ 904	3.46	4.34	4.03	4.04	3.00

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

Course-Section: EDUC 602 0101 University of Maryland Page 609 Title INSTRUCTIONAL SYS DEV Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	4.83	4.48	4.31	4.46	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	851/1566	3.96	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	4.88	4.42	4.12	4.33	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	4.83	4.43	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	953/1626	4.40	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	820/1384	4.17	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	970/1378	4.21	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	4.96	4.75	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	820/ 904	3.46	4.34	4.03	4.04	3.00
Exam	0000	Diat	i b.	.+	•									

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

Course-Section: EDUC 602 0201

Title INSTRUCTIONAL SYS DEV

Instructor: SINGER, JONATHA

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 610 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Cour	se Evaluation	Questionnaire
--------------	---------------	---------------

			Fre	eaue	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Conoral														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	902/1670	4.83	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	622/1666		4.45	4.27	4.34	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1		****/1406		4.50	4.32	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50			4.51	4.24	4.33	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	2		1078/1566		4.14	4.07	4.20	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	421/1528		4.42	4.12	4.33	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33			4.43	4.22	4.30	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1667		4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	324/1626	4.40	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1022/1559	4.70	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	1163/1560	4.80	4.86	4.72	4.81	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	1027/1549	4.60	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	849/1546	4.70	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1125/1323	4.13	4.12	4.00	4.03	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	324/1384	4.17	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	316/1378	4.21	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	354/1378	4.96	4.75	4.31	4.51	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	123/ 904	3.46	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	3.38	4.19	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	3.21	4.21	4.53	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	3.82	4.44	4.69	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	4.10	4.31	4.58	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 218	***	3.83	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 87	****	4.68	4.65	4.61	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.43	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 75	****	4.61	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 79	****	4.47	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.40	3.97	4.32	****
Field Work	_			_		_								
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	4.76	4.50	4.65	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 38	****	4.26	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 38	****	4.44	4.62	4.65	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	4.33	4.27	4.59	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.41	4.47	4.59	****
Self Paced	_	0	•	0	0	•		F 00	****	ate ate ate a	2 55	4	4 00	
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 28	****	3.57	4.64	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,		4.17	4.67	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00		****	4.67	4.54	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	4.40	4.84	4.90	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	5.00	****

Course-Section: EDUC 602 0201

Title INSTRUCTIONAL SYS DEV

Instructor: SINGER, JONATHA

Enrollment: 8
Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 610 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	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	0	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 602T 8010 University of Maryland Title INSTRUCTIONAL SYS DEV Baltimore County

Spring 2008

Page 611

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: HODELL, CHARLES Enrollment: 8

Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	MD	NA	Fro	_	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	_		Level Mean	
Quescions	11117	11/24						Mean	Railk	Mean			Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1666		4.45	4.27	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	224/1615	4.83	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.14	4.07	4.20	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	173/1528	4.80	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.43	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	278/1626	4.67	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	266/1549	4.83	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	310/1546			4.32	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	273/1323			4.00	4.03	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	205/1384	4.83	4.50	1 10	4.21	1 02
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	5		,	4.83	4.68	4.29	4.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	354/1378		4.75	4.31	4.51	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	4		202/ 904				4.04	
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	4.43			****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 75	****		4.57		****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 79	****	4.47			****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.40	3.97	4.32	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
				_					_					

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	4	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	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	4	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	6	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 603 8010 Title

INSTR SYS DEV II

PETSKA, DEBORAH Instructor:

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 612 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			Frequencies						Inst	ructor	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 exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Did goals discussions contribute to what you learned 8. How many times was class cancelled 8. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 8. Did addiovisual techniques contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understandin		Questions	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 exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Did goals discussions contribute to what you learned 8. How many times was class cancelled 8. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 8. Did addiovisual techniques contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understandin																
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. Do 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1528 5.00 4.42 4.12 4.33 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1528 5.00 4.42 4.12 4.33 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1528 5.00 4.42 4.12 4.33 5.00 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1560 5.00 4.83 4.67 4.74 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 3. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did also siscussions contribute to what you learned 6. Did delass discussions contribute to what you learned 9. 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1580 5.00 4.86 4.72 4.81 5.00 9. Were all students actively encouraged to participate of the part	1		Λ	0	Λ	Λ	Λ	Λ	7	E 00	1/1670	E 00	1 10	1 21	1 16	E 00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 261/1406 4.80 4.50 4.32 4.36 4.80 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.5																
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1615 5.00 4.51 4.24 4.33 5.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1525 5.00 4.51 4.24 4.33 5.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1525 5.00 4.43 4.22 4.33 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1650 5.00 4.43 4.22 4.33 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1650 5.00 4.43 4.67 4.74 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1650 5.00 4.83 4.67 4.74 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0																
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assigned to contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assigned to contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 6. 5.00 1/1528 5.00 4.42 4.12 4.33 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 7. 5.00 1/1665 5.00 4.83 4.22 4.30 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 2. 4 4.67 278/1626 4.67 4.74 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 2. 4 4.67 278/1626 4.67 4.27 4.11 4.20 4.67 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 9. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 1.66 5.00 4.88 4.59 4.46 4.49 4.86 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0.									_							
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. O 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1650 5.00 4.43 4.22 4.30 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. O 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1667 5.00 4.83 4.67 4.74 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. O 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1667 5.00 4.83 4.67 4.74 5.00 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. Ecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 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 to the lectures contribute to what you learned 7. Discussion 8. Discussion 8. Discussion 9. Discussion 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did the instructor encouraged to participate 9. Did the instructor encouraged fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase outlets to what you learned 9. Did the lab increase outlets to what you learned 9. Did the lab increase outlets to what you learned 9. Did the lab increase outlets to what you learned 9. Did the lab increase outlets to what you learned 9. Did the lab increase outlets to what you learned 9. Did the lab increase outlets to what you learned 9. Did the lab increase outlets to what you learned 9. Did the lab increase outlets to what you learned 9. Did prepentation of contribute to what you learned 9. Did green actions outlet to what you learned 9. Did green actions outlet to what you learned 9. Did green actions outlet to what you learned 9. Did green contribute to what you learned 9. Did green could								-	-							
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1650 5.00 4.43 4.22 4.30 5.00 8. How many times was class canceled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1650 5.00 4.83 4.67 4.74 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 278/1626 4.67 4.27 4.11 4.20 4.67 Lecture Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 355/1559 4.86 4.59 4.46 4.49 4.86 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1560 5.00 4.86 4.72 4.81 5.00 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0																
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1667 5.00 4.83 4.67 4.74 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1667 6.00 4.83 4.67 4.27 4.11 4.20 4.67 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. O 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1328 5.00 4.50 4.10 4.21 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9. O 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1328 5.00 4.50 4.10 4.21 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. 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. O 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 23 **** 4.74 4.54 5.00 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. O 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 23 **** 4.74 4.74 4.54 5.80 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. O 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 23 **** 4.74 4.74 4.75 4.66 5.00 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. O 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 23 **** 4.74 4.74 4.74 4.75 4.75 5. Did contribute to what you learned 6. O 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 23 **** 4.74 4.74 4.75 4.75 6. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 7. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 8. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 8. Did study questions make cle		-														
Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned one of the intervence of the interven				-	-			-								
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did adulovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Were special techniques successful 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 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 presentations contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. O O O O O D D S S.OO S.OO S.OO S.OO S.								-	-		,					
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. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open 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 4. Were special techniques successful 5. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6. O. O. O. O. O. T. S.OO. 1/1378 5.OO. 4.68 4.29 4.42 5.OO 8. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 8. Was the instructor available for individual attention 8. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8. Was the instructor available for individual attention 8. Were citeria for grading made clear 8. Were citeria for grading made clear 8. Were citeria for grading made clear 8. Was the instructor available for consultation 8. Were citeria for grading made clear 8. Did you clearly understand your evaluations 8. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 8. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 8. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 8. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study	٠.	now would you grade the overall teaching circultations	_	O	O	O	O	2	1	1.07	270/1020	1.07	1.27	1.11	1.20	1.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 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 field experience contribute to what you learned 5. Did on 0. D. D. Did the sample for consultation 6. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 7. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. O 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 3.57 4.64 4.82 **** 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. O 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 3.57 4.64 4.82 **** 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal		Lecture														
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. Discussion 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9. O 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1378 5.00 4.68 4.29 4.42 5.00 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. O 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	355/1559	4.86	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 144/1323 4.86 4.43 4.32 4.40 4.86 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 144/1323 4.83 4.12 4.00 4.03 4.83 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1378 5.00 4.68 4.29 4.42 5.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00	2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful 4. Were special techniques successful 5. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6. O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O	3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	248/1549	4.86	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.86
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful 2. Laboratory 2. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 3. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 4. 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 gresentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did greentations on the project of the property	4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	288/1546	4.86	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.86
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1378 5.00 4.68 4.29 4.42 5.00 4.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	144/1323	4.83	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.83
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1378 5.00 4.68 4.29 4.42 5.00 4.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0																
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1378 5.00 4.68 4.29 4.42 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1378 5.00 4.75 4.31 4.51 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 120/904 4.86 4.34 4.03 4.04 4.86 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 3.38 4.19 4.30 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 3.4 4.19 4.30 **** 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 3.4 4.19 4.30 **** 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 3.38 4.19 4.30 **** 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 3.38 4.19 4.30 **** 1. Were assigned topics relevant to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 ****/ 24 4.50 4.61 4.57 4.66 5.00 1 1 1 4.50 53/79 4.50 4.63 4.64 4.67 4.50 1 1 1 4.50 53/79 4.50 4.63 4.64 4.67 4.50 1 1 1 4.50 53/79 4.50 4.61 4.57 4.66 5.00 1 1 1 4.50 53/79 4.50 4.61 4.57 4.66 5.00 1 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.47 4.45 4.58 **** 1. Were criteria for grading made clear 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.47 4.45 4.58 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.26 4.19 4.58 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.26 4.19 4.58 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.44 4.62 4.65 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.44 4.62 4.65 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.44 4.62 4.65 **** 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 16 **** 4.17 4.67 4.60 ****			_	_				_	_							
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 120/904 4.86 4.34 4.03 4.04 4.86 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 3.38 4.19 4.30 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 3.38 4.19 4.30 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 53/79 4.50 4.68 4.65 4.61 5.00 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50		-	-	-	-	-	-	-								
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 3.38 4.19 4.30 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 53/ 79 4.50 4.68 4.65 4.61 5.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.47 4.45 4.58 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 4.76 4.50 4.65 5.00 4.65 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 4.76 4.50 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.00 4.65 5.0								-	-		,					
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 3.38 4.19 4.30 **** 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 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 53/ 79 4.50 4.43 4.64 4.67 4.50 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 75 5.00 4.61 4.57 4.66 5.00 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.47 4.45 4.58 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 4.76 4.50 4.65 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.26 4.19 4.58 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.26 4.19 4.58 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.24 4.62 4.65 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.41 4.47 4.59 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 16 **** 4.17 4.67 4.60 ****		-														
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 3.38 4.19 4.30 **** 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 87 5.00 4.68 4.65 4.61 5.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 53/ 79 4.50 4.43 4.64 4.67 4.50 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 75 5.00 4.61 4.57 4.66 5.00 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.47 4.45 4.58 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 4.76 4.50 4.65 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 4.76 4.50 4.65 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.26 4.19 4.58 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.44 4.62 4.65 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.44 4.62 4.65 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.41 4.47 4.59 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 3.57 4.64 4.82 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 16 **** 4.17 4.67 4.60 ****	4.	Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	120/ 904	4.86	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.86
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 3.38 4.19 4.30 **** 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 87 5.00 4.68 4.65 4.61 5.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 53/ 79 4.50 4.43 4.64 4.67 4.50 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 75 5.00 4.61 4.57 4.66 5.00 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.47 4.45 4.58 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 4.76 4.50 4.65 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 4.76 4.50 4.65 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.26 4.19 4.58 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.44 4.62 4.65 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.44 4.62 4.65 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.41 4.47 4.59 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 3.57 4.64 4.82 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 16 **** 4.17 4.67 4.60 ****		Laboratory														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/87 5.00 4.68 4.65 4.61 5.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 5 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 53/79 4.50 4.43 4.64 4.67 4.50 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/75 5.00 4.61 4.57 4.66 5.00 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.47 4.45 4.58 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 4.76 4.50 4.65 **** 2. Did gou clearly understand your evaluation criteria 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.26 4.19 4.58 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.26 4.19 4.58 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.44 4.62 4.65 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.41 4.47 4.59 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.41 4.47 4.59 **** 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 16 **** 4.17 4.67 4.60 ****	1.	-	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	3.38	4.19	4.30	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/87 5.00 4.68 4.65 4.61 5.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 5 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 53/79 4.50 4.43 4.64 4.67 4.50 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/75 5.00 4.61 4.57 4.66 5.00 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.47 4.45 4.58 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 4.76 4.50 4.65 **** 2. Did gou clearly understand your evaluation criteria 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.26 4.19 4.58 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.26 4.19 4.58 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.44 4.62 4.65 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.41 4.47 4.59 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.41 4.47 4.59 **** 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 16 **** 4.17 4.67 4.60 ****																
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 5 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 53/ 79 4.50 4.43 4.64 4.67 4.50 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 75 5.00 4.61 4.57 4.66 5.00 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.47 4.45 4.58 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 80 5.00 4.40 3.97 4.32 5.00 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 4.76 4.50 4.65 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.26 4.19 4.58 **** 4.76 4.50 4.65 **** 4.76 4.50 4.65 **** 4.76 4.50 4.65 **** 5. Did conferences help you discuss your evaluations 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.44 4.62 4.65 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.41 4.47 4.59 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.41 4.47 4.59 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 16 **** 4.17 4.67 4.60 ****																
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned		9 1							_		, -					
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.47 4.45 4.58 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 80 5.00 4.40 3.97 4.32 5.00 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 4.76 4.50 4.65 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.26 4.19 4.58 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.44 4.62 4.65 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** 4.33 4.27 4.59 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.41 4.47 4.59 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 16 **** 4.17 4.67 4.60 ****								_								
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 4.76 4.50 4.65 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.26 4.19 4.58 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.44 4.62 4.65 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** 4.33 4.27 4.59 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.41 4.47 4.59 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 3.57 4.64 4.82 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 16 **** 4.17 4.67 4.60 ****																
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 4.76 4.50 4.65 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.26 4.19 4.58 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.44 4.62 4.65 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** 4.33 4.27 4.59 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.41 4.47 4.59 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 3.57 4.64 4.82 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 16 **** 4.17 4.67 4.60 ****		-						-								
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 4.76 4.50 4.65 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.26 4.19 4.58 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.44 4.62 4.65 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** 4.33 4.27 4.59 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.41 4.47 4.59 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 3.57 4.64 4.82 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 16 **** 4.17 4.67 4.60 ****	5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.40	3.97	4.32	5.00
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 4.76 4.50 4.65 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.26 4.19 4.58 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.44 4.62 4.65 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** 4.33 4.27 4.59 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.41 4.47 4.59 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 3.57 4.64 4.82 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 16 **** 4.17 4.67 4.60 ****		Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.26 4.19 4.58 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.44 4.62 4.65 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** 4.33 4.27 4.59 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.41 4.47 4.59 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 3.57 4.64 4.82 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 16 **** 4.17 4.67 4.60 ****	1		6	0	0	Ο	Ο	Ω	1	5 00	****/ 41	****	4 76	4 50	4 65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 6 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.44 4.62 4.65 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 6 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** 4.33 4.27 4.59 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.41 4.47 4.59 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 3.57 4.64 4.82 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 16 **** 4.17 4.67 4.60 ****								•	_		,					****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 6 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** 4.33 4.27 4.59 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.41 4.47 4.59 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 3.57 4.64 4.82 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 16 **** 4.17 4.67 4.60 ****			-		-			U	_		,					****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.41 4.47 4.59 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 3.57 4.64 4.82 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 16 **** 4.17 4.67 4.60 ****			-					-	_		,					****
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 3.57 4.64 4.82 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 6 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 16 **** 4.17 4.67 4.60 ****								-	_		,					
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 3.57 4.64 4.82 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 6 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 16 **** 4.17 4.67 4.60 ****	٥.	bid conferences help you early out field activities	O	O	O	Ü	O	Ü	_	3.00	, 51		1.11	1.17	1.55	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 6 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 16 **** 4.17 4.67 4.60 ****		Self Paced														
2. Did beddy questions make creat the expected goal 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 / 10 1.17 1.07	1.	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	3.57	4.64	4.82	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 6 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 27 **** 4.67 4.54 4.67 ****	2.	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.17	4.67	4.60	****
	3.	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.67	4.54	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 6 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 10 **** 4.40 4.84 4.90 ****	4.	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	4.40	4.84	4.90	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 6 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 6 **** **** 4.92 5.00 ****	5.	Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	5.00	****

Course-Section: EDUC 603 8010 Title INSTR SYS DEV II Instructor:

PETSKA, DEBORAH

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 7 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 612 AUG 6, 2008 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	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 607 0101 University of Maryland
Title PROCESSES & ACQ READIN Baltimore County
Instructor: YOUNG, PATRICIA Spring 2008

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

0

2

84-150

Grad.

3.00-3.49 0

3.50-4.00 1

D 0

F 0

0

0

P 0

I

?

8

University of Maryland Page 613

Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

0

6

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

							Fr	eque	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 .1															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	1	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.00
_	-	ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	1	0	4		1070/1666		4.45	4.27	4.34	4.17
		estions reflec			1	2	0	1	2	0	1		1325/1406		4.50	4.32	4.36	3.25
	_	ations reflect			1	0	1	0	1	0	4		1083/1615	4.00	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.00
				what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17			4.14	4.07	4.20	4.17
	_	_		to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	0	4		1202/1528		4.42	4.12	4.33	3.67
		system clearl		-	1	0	0	0	1	1	_	4.50	- ,		4.43	4.22	4.30	4.50
		was class cand		illica	1	0	0	0	0	1	5		805/1667		4.83	4.67	4.74	
	-			ching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	2	-		1438/1626		4.27	4.11		3.40
J. 110	u_u_ / ou _	jiado ono overo		Jillig Gliddolveness	_	Ŭ	_	·	_	_	_	3.10	1130,1010	3.10	1.27		1.20	5.10
	Lecture																	
1. Were th	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							1	1	0	4	4.17	1218/1559	4.17	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.17
2. Did the	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1248/1560	4.50	4.86	4.72	4.81	4.50
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	ed and e	explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	1053/1549	4.17	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.17
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	1517/1546	2.67	4.43	4.32	4.40	2.67
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1040/1323	3.50	4.12	4.00	4.03	3.50
		Discus	ai on															
1 Did al.				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	324/1384	4.67	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.67
				ed to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	- ,		4.68	4.10	4.42	4.83
		_	_	nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378		4.75	4.29	4.42	
		cchniques succe		d open discussion	1	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	461/ 904		4.75		4.04	
4. Were s	peciai te	eciniques succe	essiui		1	3	U	U	U	3	U	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.00
	Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n												
Crodita E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Do	asons				т	~			Majors	
CLEATER F	armea	Cuiii. GPA	·	Expected Grades					220115	- 			Ту:	 he			majors	
00-27 3 0.00-0.99 1 A 3						Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	e	2	Majo	or	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2			-			-								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	major	2
	_		_	_													-	

Electives

Other

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: EDUC 608 0101 University of Maryland Page 614 Title INSTRUCT READING AUG 6, 2008 Instructor: SHELTON, NANCY Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 4

6

		Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General													,	
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.51	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.14	4.07	4.20	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	221/1528	4.75	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	272/1650	4.75	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1157/1667	4.50	4.83	4.67	4.74	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.27	4.11	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.40	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.34	4.03	4.04	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	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	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				2	Λ						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: EDUC 615 0101 Title MATERIALS TEACH READ Spring 2008 Instructor: YOUNG, PATRICIA

Enrollment:

9

Page 615 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires:	7	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

	Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	Ω	1	3	3	4.29	964/1670	4.29	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	529/1666		4.45	4.27	4.34	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	1	1	0		1275/1406		4.50	4.32	4.36	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	379/1615	4.67	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	470/1566		4.14	4.07	4.20	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	867/1650		4.43	4.22	4.30	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1347/1626	3.60	4.27	4.11	4.20	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1199/1559	4.20	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	1		1427/1560	4.20	4.86	4.72	4.81	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	2	1		1285/1549	3.80	4.53	4.31	4.37	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	0		1411/1546		4.43	4.32	4.40	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	871/1323		4.12	4.00	4.03	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	953/1384	3.86	4.50	4.10	4.21	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	915/1378	4.17	4.75	4.31	4.51	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	698/ 904		4.34	4.03	4.04	3.60
Freq	ıency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	ı

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

Course-Section: EDUC 622 0101 University of Maryland

Title INSTRUC STRGY ELEM MAT Baltimore County Spring 2008 Instructor: KINACH, BARBARA

Enrollment:	12			
Questionnaires:	11	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			272		_	ncies	3	-		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect			
		Question	s 		NR	NA	1	2	3 	4	5 	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,ski	lls from	m this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	737/1670	4.45	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.45
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	943/1666	4.27	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.27
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the ex	xpected goals	0	8	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1057/1406	4.00	4.50	4.32	4.36	4.00
		ations reflect			1	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	813/1615	4.30	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.30
	-	-		what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	2	5		1010/1566	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.20	3.91
		_		what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	847/1528	4.09	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.09
		g system clearly		ined	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	645/1650	4.45	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.45
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	675/1667	4.91	4.83	4.67	4.74	4.91
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	637/1626	4.33	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.33
		Lectur	_															
5. Did aud	diovisual		_	our understanding	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1323	****	4.12	4.00	4.03	****
	•																	
	Discussion																	
				what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	0	8	4.36	579/1384		4.50	4.10	4.21	4.36
		_	_	d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	243/1378		4.68	4.29	4.42	4.91
				d open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64				4.31	4.51	4.64
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	sstul		0	1	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	345/ 904	4.30	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.30
		Self	Paced															
1. Did sel	f-paced	system contrib	ute to v	what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	3.57	4.64	4.82	****
				Frequ	lency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	n									
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors				
00-27	A 6		Red	 guire	ed fo	or Ma	ijor	 S	0	Graduat	 е	5	Majo	 r	0			
28-55	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 4						-			,						3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0													-	
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
P 0													respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
	I 0						ner					9						

Page 616 AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: EDUC 625 0101 University of Maryland Page 617 Title TEACH READ WRIT ESL I Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SHIN, SARAH

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Frequencies Ir						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questions				NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
		General																	
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skills	s from this	s cou	ırse	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear th	ne expected	d goa	ıls	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	415/1666	4.67	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.67
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflect t	the expecte	ed go	als	0	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	1057/1406	4.00	4.50	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect th	ne expected	d goa	ıls	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	775/1615	4.33	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.33
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribute	e to what	you 1	earned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	159/1566	4.86	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.86
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contribu	ite to what	you	learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	147/1528	4.86	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.86
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearly e	explained			0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	307/1650	4.71	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.71
8. How ma	ny times	was class cancell	led			0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	970/1667	4.71	4.83	4.67	4.74	4.71
9. How wo	. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiven								0	0	2	4	4.67	278/1626	4.67	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.67
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures w	well prepar	red		0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	809/1559	4.57	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.57
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem interest	ted in the	subj	ect	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presented a	and explain	ned c	learly	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	424/1549	4.71	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.71
		es contribute to v	_		_	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	822/1546	4.43	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.43
		l techniques enhar	_			0	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	936/1323	3.71	4.12	4.00	4.03	3.71
		Discussio	on																
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribute	e to what v	zou 1	earned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	285/1384	4.71	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.71
		nts actively encou				0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.42	5.00
		_			_	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	333/1378	4.86	4.75	4.31	4.51	4.86
	3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful							0	0	2	2	2	4.00	461/ 904		4.34	4.03	4.04	4.00
					Freq	uency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade									Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	\$
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1 1.00-1.99 0		A B	5 0		Required for Majors 0							Graduat	е	6	Majo	or	7

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	<u>.</u>	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	Α	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	7
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.	6	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7	=			
				2	1						

Course-Section: EDUC 644 0101 University of Maryland Title LING/ESOL EDUCATORS Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SHIN, SARAH

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 618

			Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	363/1670	4.75	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	198/1666	4.88	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	318/1406	4.75	4.50	4.32	4.36	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	290/1615	4.75	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	226/1566	4.75	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	240/1528	4.73	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	111/1650	4.94	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	339/1626	4.58	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	Ο	Ω	0	4	12	4.75	521/1559	4.75	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1560		4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	333/1546	4.81	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	326/1323	4.50	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.50
1														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	372/1384	4.60	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	285/1378	4.87	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	197/1378	4.93	4.75	4.31	4.51	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful		0	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	367/ 904	4.27	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.27

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	-	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 650 0101 Title

EDUC IN CULTURAL PERSP

SMITH JR, MURDU Instructor: Enrollment: 30

Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 619 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequenc				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	2	4	19	4.68	466/1670	4.68	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	10	12	4.36	833/1666	4.36	4.45	4.27	4.34	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	20	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1406	****		4.32	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	401/1615	4.64	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	3	14	4.08	802/1566	4.08	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	11	12	4.40	560/1528	4.40	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	17	4.52	541/1650	4.52	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	730/1667	4.88	4.83	4.67	4.74	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	2	3	13	4.42	531/1626	4.42	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	6	15	4.52	871/1559	4.52	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	699/1560	4.87	4.86	4.72	4.81	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	5	15	4.48	722/1549	4.48	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	532/1546	4.65	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	5	6	9	4.20	590/1323	4.20	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	200/1384	4.84	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.84
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	146/1378	4.95	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	128/ 904	4.80	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.80
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2.4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.68	4.65	4.61	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.43	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.61	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.47	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.40	3.97	4.32	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Charlier Francis Charles (D. D. Danierted Charles	_			Da		_							Ma dana	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				кеа	ason	.s 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	 А	20	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	12	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		Under-grad	13	Non-major	25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	21	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 655 0101 Baltimore County Title TCH READ WRIT ESL II Instructor: CRANDALL, JOANN

Enrollment:

56-83

Grad.

84-150

0

0

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

0

0

5

18

University of Maryland Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

0

15

Under-grad 11

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Page 620

AUG 6, 2008

Non-major

Onest	ionnaires:	18	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Quest	TOIMIATIES.	10	bludent	COULDE	E valuation	Ouescronnarie

С

D

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

0

0

0

	-						ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	224/1670	4.88	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	198/1666	4.88	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	226/1406	4.86	4.50	4.32	4.36	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	281/1615	4.76	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	79/1566	4.94	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	73/1528	4.94	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	263/1650	4.76	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	712/1667	4.88	4.83	4.67	4.74	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	167/1626	4.80	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	141/1549	4.93	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	276/1546	4.87	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	403/1323	4.43	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	608/1384	4.33	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	4		4.60	525/1378	4.60	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	323/1378	4.87	4.75	4.31	4.51	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	186/ 904			4.03	4.04	
Frequ	encv	Dist	rib	ıt i or	า									
11044	01107	220			-									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 13		Red	 quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	 e	7	Majc		12
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 1	negation for hajorb											5		

General

Other

Electives

Course-Section: EDUC 658 0101

READING CONTENT AREA I

Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 19 Ouestionnaires: 18

Spring 2008 NORTH-COLEMAN,

Page 621 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

0 3.00 ****/ 28 **** 3.57 4.64 4.82

0 3.00 ****/ 16 **** 4.17 4.67 4.60

0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 27 **** 4.67 4.54 4.67 ****

0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 10 **** 4.40 4.84 4.90 ****

			Frequencies			Tnat	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.evre.1	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	1	14	4.56	611/1670		4.48	4.31	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	9		1070/1666	4.17	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	1	1	0	0		****/1406	****	4.50	4.32	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	499/1615	4.56	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	6	5		1210/1566	3.65	4.14	4.07	4.20	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	•	2	2	1	12	4.35	611/1528	4.35	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	2	4	8		1347/1650	3.78	4.43	4.22	4.30	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	2	4	16	4.89	712/1667	4.89	4.83	4.67	4.74	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	U	U	Τ	2	4	9	4.31	659/1626	4.31	4.2/	4.11	4.20	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	419/1559	4.81	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	673/1560	4.88	4.86	4.72	4.81	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	1	10	4.33	900/1549	4.33	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	2	11	4.38	879/1546	4.38	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	326/1323		4.12	4.00	4.03	4.50
	_			-	-	_			,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	1	11	4.47	476/1384	4.47	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	2	3	8	4.13	919/1378	4.13	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	3	1	10	4.33	813/1378	4.33	4.75	4.31	4.51	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	279/ 904	4.43	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.43
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 87	****	4.68	4.65	4.61	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 79	****	4.43	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 75	****	4.61	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	4.47	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.40	3.97	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	Λ	0	2	5 00	****/ 41	****	4.76	4.50	4.65	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 38	****	4.76	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 38	****	4.44	4.62	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 39	****	4.33	4.02	4.59	****
1. 10 what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	U	U	U	_	_	U	3.30	/ 39		1.33	1.2/	1.33	

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

17 0 0 Frequency Distribution

1

0

17

17

17

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	A	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	 17	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	8	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	10	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sid	nificant	
				I	0	Other	18	-	_	-	

? 0

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

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 5

5

University of Maryland Page 622 AUG 6, 2008 Baltimore County Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

					Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questions	5		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	=	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.46	5.00
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.34	5.00
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	****	4.50	4.32	4.36	****
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.51	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	706/1566	4.20	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.20
6. Did wri	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	173/1528	4.80	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.80
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.43	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How wou	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.27	4.11	4.20	5.00
1 77		Lecture			0	0	0	^	^	1	4	4 00	425 /1550	4 00	4 50	1 10	4 40	4 00
			s lectures well prepared eem interested in the subject					0	0	T	4	4.80	435/1559	4.80 5.00	4.59	4.46	4.49 4.81	4.80
	 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear 						0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560 294/1549	4.80	4.86 4.53	4.72 4.31		5.00
		erial presented s contribute to		-	0	0	0	0	0	1			345/1549	4.80	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.80 4.80
				you rearned our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.80	273/1323	4.80	4.43	4.32		4.60
5. Did aud	alovisual	techniques em	lance y	our understanding	U	U	U	U	U	2	3	4.60	2/3/1323	4.60	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.60
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ite to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.50
2. Were al	ll studen	ts actively end	courage	d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage :	fair an	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	439/1378	4.75	4.75	4.31	4.51	4.75
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful	-	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	373/ 904	4.25	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.25
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А 5		Rec	uire	ed fo	or Ma	iors	3	0	Graduat	e	3	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0			_									3 -		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General							0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives							0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	rh
				P 0									response	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	

Other

4

I 0

? 0

Baltimore County

Course-Section: EDUC 669 0101

2

ASSESS READING

SHELTON, NANCY

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland Page 623 AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies											_	
				_		3	_		tructor	Course	_			Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	665/1670	4.42	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	622/1666	4.25	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	552/1615	4.36	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	389/1566	3.97	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	421/1528	4.56	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	570/1650	4.31	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1157/1667	4.75	4.83	4.67	4.74	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	953/1626	3.94	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	0		1461/1559	4.00	4.59	4.46	4.49	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	4.88	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	0		1389/1549	3.63	4.53	4.31	4.37	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0		1139/1546	4.06	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	692/1323	3.50	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.00
Discussion														
	^	0	0	^	0	0	_	4 00	000/1204	4 00	4 50	4 10	4 01	4 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	820/1384	4.22	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	4.83	4.68	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	-	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	4.67	4.75	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 904	4.64	4.34	4.03	4.04	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	34/ 41	4.00	4.76	4.50	4.65	4.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	32/ 38	3.50	4.26	4.19	4.58	3.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	33/ 38	4.00	4.44	4.62	4.65	4.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	25/ 39	4.00	4.33	4.27	4.59	4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	21/ 31	4.00	4.41	4.47	4.59	4.00
_			,											
Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	lt101	n									
													_	

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Spring 2008

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

Questionnaires: 9

E	age	624
AUG	6,	2008
Job	IRBI	R3029

			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	1	4	4	4.33	902/1670	4.42	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1199/1666	4.25	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1406	****	4.50	4.32	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	910/1615	4.36	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1322/1566	3.97	4.14	4.07	4.20	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	330/1528	4.56	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1067/1650	4.31	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	4.75	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	7	0	3.88	1152/1626	3.94	4.27	4.11	4.20	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	896/1559	4.00	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	948/1560	4.88	4.86	4.72	4.81	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1308/1549	3.63	4.53	4.31	4.37	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	1087/1546	4.06	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	0	2	2	1	3.00	1179/1323	3.50	4.12	4.00	4.03	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	498/1384	4.22	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	481/1378	4.83	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	813/1378	4.67	4.75	4.31	4.51	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	356/ 904		4.34	4.03	4.04	4.29

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	8	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	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: EDUC 671 8010 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF TRNG AND DEV

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 625 AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: STORY, VIRGINIA

Enrollment: 14 Ouestionnaires: 13

28-55

56-83

Grad.

84-150

0

0

0

1.00-1.99

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

0

1

3

в 0

0

0

0

C

D

F

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			_							_				
Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level	S M
General	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	1 60	EE7/167	1 60	1 10	1 21	1 16	4
Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3 4	0	0	0	0	2	8 7	4.60 4.78	557/167		4.48 4.45	4.31	4.46	
Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	8	0	0	0	0	2		291/1660			4.27		
			0		0	0	7				4.50	4.32	4.36	
Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	3	-	0	-	-	-		1/161		4.51	4.24	4.33	
Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	589/156			4.07	4.20	
Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1 0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	202/152		4.42	4.12	4.33	
Was the grading system clearly explained	3	-	0	-	0		10		1/165			4.22	4.30	
How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/166		4.83	4.67	4.74	
How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	637/162	5 4.33	4.27	4.11	4.20	
Lecture														
Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	971/155		4.59	4.46	4.49	
Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/156		4.86	4.72	4.81	
Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	762/1549	9 4.44	4.53	4.31	4.37	
Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	655/154	4.56	4.43	4.32	4.40	
Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	2	1	1	5	4.00	692/132	3 4.00	4.12	4.00	4.03	
Discussion														
Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/138	4 5.00	4.50	4.10	4.21	
Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	264/1378	3 4.89	4.68	4.29	4.42	
Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1378	3 5.00	4.75	4.31	4.51	
Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	222/ 90	4.56	4.34	4.03	4.04	
Seminar														
Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 8'	7 5.00	4.68	4.65	4.61	
Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	44/ 79	9 4.80	4.43	4.64	4.67	
Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 7	5.00	4.61	4.57	4.66	
Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 7	5.00	4.47	4.45	4.58	
Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 8		4.40	3.97	4.32	
Field Work														
Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 43	1 ****	4.76	4.50	4.65	
Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 3	3 ****	4.26	4.19	4.58	
Was the instructor available for consultation	11	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 3		4.44	4.62	4.65	
To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39		4.33	4.27	4.59	
Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 3		4.41	4.47	4.59	
Self Paced														
Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	3 ****	3.57	4.64	4.82	
Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 10	-	4.17	4.67	4.60	
Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 2'		4.67	4.54	4.67	
Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 1		4.40	4.84	4.90	
Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	_		,	5 ****	****	4.92	5.00	
Frequ	.ency	n Dist	trib	utior	n									
edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	-				asons	=			π,	уре			Majors	7
eurla marmeu - Cum. GPA - EXPECTED GFADES				Rec	200118	>			1	۶ P.C			Ma JUES	>

General

Electives

0

0

9

- Means there are not enough

Non-major

Under-grad

Course-Section: EDUC 678 0101 University of Maryland
Title INST STRAT/DIV NEEDS Baltimore County
Instructor: BERGE, NANCY B Spring 2008

University of Maryland Page 626
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	22				
Questionnaires:	15	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies	5		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1 Did voi	u gain ne	Genera. w insights,ski		this course	0	0	0	1	3	3	8	4 20	1060/1670	3.95	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.20
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	2	7	5		1161/1666	3.93	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.07
		ations reflect			0	0	1	1	1	5	7		1050/1615		4.51	4.24	4.33	4.07
				hat you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	632/1566		4.14	4.07	4.20	4.27
				what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	398/1528	4.49	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.53
		system clearly			0	0	0	0	5	1	9	4.27	891/1650		4.43	4.22	4.30	4.27
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	472/1667		4.83	4.67	4.74	4.93
				ing effectiveness	2	1	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	1106/1626		4.27		4.20	
		Lecture	_															
1 Wara th	ho inatri	Lecture actor's lecture		roparod	4	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	846/1559	4.16	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.55
		ctor's lecture			4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1560	4.72	4.86	4.72	4.49	5.00
				olained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	525/1549	4.72	4.53	4.72	4.37	4.64
		es contribute to			4	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	557/1546		4.43	4.32	4.40	4.64
				ur understanding	4	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	374/1323	4.28	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.45
J. Dia au	aiovibaai	ceemingues em	lance you	ar anacrocanaring	-	O	O	O	_	-	O	1.15	57171525	1.20	1.12	1.00	1.05	1.15
		Discus																
				nat you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	541/1384		4.50	4.10	4.21	4.40
		_	_	to participate	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	495/1378	4.32	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.64
				open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	590/1378	4.38	4.75	4.31	4.51	
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		0	1	2	1	2	2	7	3.79	614/ 904	3.89	4.34	4.03	4.04	3.79
		Field	Work															
1. Did fie	eld exper	rience contribu	te to wha	at you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.76	4.50	4.65	****
2. Did you	u clearly	understand you	ur evalua	ation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	4.26	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the	e instruc	ctor available :	for cons	ultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.44	4.62	4.65	****
4. To what	t degree	could you disc	uss your	evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.33	4.27	4.59	****
5. Did cor	nferences	s help you carr	y out fi	eld activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.41	4.47	4.59	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ation	า									
				_	-													
Credits Ea	s Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	asons	5 			Ту	pe 			Majors	
00-27	4 0.00-0.99 2 A 12					Re	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	7	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	15
84-150	4-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0																	
Grad.	Grad. 7 3.50-4.00 9 F 0					El	ectiv	ves				0	#### -					ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
	I 0					Ot]	her				1	.2						
				? 0														

Course-Section: EDUC 678 0201 Title

University of Maryland INST STRAT/DIV NEEDS

I

0

0

Instructor: DANNA, S Enrollment: 10

Questionnaires: 10

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 627 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions					Fr 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General																
1. Did you	ı gain ne		ls from this course	0	0	1	2	1	1	5	3.70	1470/16	70	3.95	4.48	4.31	4.46	3.70
			the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	1	4	3.80	1383/16	66	3.93	4.45	4.27	4.34	3.80
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the expected goals	0	7	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1314/14	06	3.33	4.50	4.32	4.36	3.33
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	552/16	15	4.28	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.50
			te to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	1	5	3.90	1010/15	66	4.08	4.14	4.07	4.20	3.90
			bute to what you learned	. 0	1	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	504/15	28	4.49	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.44
		, system clearly		0	0	0	0	3	2	5		973/16			4.43		4.30	4.20
	-	was class cance		0	0	0	0	1	3	6		1157/16		4.72		4.67		4.50
9. How wou	ıld you g	rade the overal	l teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1335/16	26	3.77	4.27	4.11	4.20	3.63
		Lecture																
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lectures	well prepared	1	0	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	1403/15	59	4.16	4.59	4.46	4.49	3.78
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem intere	sted in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	1294/15	60	4.72	4.86	4.72	4.81	4.44
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presented	and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1146/15	49	4.32	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.00
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute to	what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	1285/15	46	4.21	4.43	4.32	4.40	3.78
5. Did aud	diovisual	. techniques enh	ance your understanding	1	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	648/13	23	4.28	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.11
		Discuss	ion															
1 Did cla	ace diecu		te to what you learned	5	0	1	1	1	1	1	3 00	1260/13	24	3.70	4.50	4.10	4.21	3.00
			ouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	2	2		970/13		4.32	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.00
			air and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	915/13		4.38			4.51	
		chniques succes		4	2	0	0	2	0	2	4.00							
		Laborat	1					_										
1. Dia the	e lab inc	rease understan	ding of the material	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 2	32	****	3.38	4.19	4.30	***
		Field W	ork															
1. Did fie	eld exper	rience contribut	e to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	41	****	4.76	4.50	4.65	***
		0-15 D																
1 Did sel	lf-paced	Self P	aced te to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2 00	****/	28	****	3 57	4 64	4.82	***
i. Dia sei	II pacca	System contribu	ec to what you rearried		O	Ü	_	O	Ü	U	2.00	,	20		3.37	1.01	1.02	
			Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Pa	asons					Тур				Majors	
	Barned Cam. Gra Bapeceed Gra																	·
00-27						quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	0	Gradu	ate	:	3	Majo	or	0
28-55																		
	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					nera	1				0	Under	-gr	ad	7	Non-	-major	10
84-150											_				_			
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	4 F 0		El	ecti	ves				0						enoug	ŗh
			P 0		٥.						0	respo	nse	s to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	

Other

9

Course-Section: EDUC 679 0101 University of Maryland OBSERVATION & ASSESSME Baltimore County

Instructor: SMALL, SUE ELLE Spring 2008

Enrollment: 6 Ouestionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 628

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 665/1670 4.50 4.48 4.31 4.46 4.50 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 0 4 4.33 870/1666 4.33 4.45 4.27 4.34 4.33 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 4 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1406 5.00 4.50 4.32 4.36 5.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 224/1615 4.83 4.51 4.24 4.33 4.83 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 170/1566 4.83 4.14 4.07 4.20 4.83 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1528 5.00 4.42 4.12 4.33 5.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 361/1650 4.67 4.43 4.22 4.30 4.67 0 0 0 6 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 1/1667 5.00 4.83 4.67 4.74 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 1 2 2 4.20 797/1626 4.20 4.27 4.11 4.20 4.20Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 3 3 4.50 896/1559 4.50 4.59 4.46 4.49 4.50 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 00 0 0 6 5.00 1/1560 5.00 4.86 4.72 4.81 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 900/1549 4.33 4.53 4.31 4.37 4.33 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 520/1546 4.67 4.43 4.32 4.40 4.67 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 1 0 5 4.67 235/1323 4.67 4.12 4.00 4.03 4.67 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 221/1384 4.80 4.50 4.10 4.21 4.80 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1378 5.00 4.68 4.29 4.42 5.00 1/1378 5.00 4.75 4.31 4.51 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 1 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 128/904 4.80 4.34 4.03 4.04 4.80 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 4.76 4.50 4.65 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 5 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.26 4.19 4.58 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 39 **** 4.33 4.27 4.59 ****

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

Course-Section: EDUC 681 8010

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 11

11

Title SURV OF INSTR TECH APP Baltimore County Instructor: KELLERMAN, PAUL

University of Maryland Page 629 AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5					_		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	290/1615	4.75	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	559/1566	4.33	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	560/1528	4.40	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	361/1650	4.67	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	831/1626	4.17	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	900/1549	4.33	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	715/1546	4.50	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	235/1323	4.67	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	740/1384	4.17	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	354/1378	4.83	4.75	4.31	4.51	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 904	****	4.34	4.03	4.04	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	3.38	4.19	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	3.21	4.21	4.53	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	3.82	4.44	4.69	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	4.10	4.31	4.58	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	3.83	4.18	4.47	****
Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00.07														
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2		Red	quir	ea ro	or Ma	ajors	5	0	Graduat	е	4	Majo	r	0
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	11
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0								_						
Grad. 4 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 P 0		Electives						1	#### - 1					n
I 0		Otl	her					4	I CDPOID	CD CO L	2 51911			

0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: EDUC 688 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 METHODOLOGY TEACH ESL Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: LINVILLE, HEATH

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 630

		Frequencies					Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA		1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_		Mean	Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0)	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	1060/1670	4.20	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0)	0	0	1	2	2		1037/1666		4.45	4.27	4.34	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0		0	0	0	3	2	4.40	715/1406		4.50	4.32	4.36	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0)	0	0	0	2	3	4.60			4.51	4.24	4.33	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0)	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	226/1566	4.75	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learner	d 1	0)	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0)	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1359/1650	3.75	4.43	4.22	4.30	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0)	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes	s 0	0)	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1347/1626	3.60	4.27	4.11	4.20	3.60
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0)	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	772/1559	4.60	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0)	0	0	0	1	4	4.80			4.86	4.72	4.81	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0)	0	0	1	2	2		1027/1549		4.53	4.31	4.37	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0)	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1293/1546	3.75	4.43	4.32	4.40	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0)	0	0	1	3	1	4.00			4.12	4.00	4.03	4.00
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0)	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	372/1384	4.60	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0)	0	0	0	1	4		- ,		4.68	4.29	4.42	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0		0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1378		4.75	4.31	4.51	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0		0	0	1	3	1	4.00	461/ 904		4.34	4.03		4.00
Fre	quency	, Di	istr	ribu	ıtior	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade					Pe:	asons				Ty	ne			Majors	
Barned Cum. GFA Expected Grade							, 								,
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 4	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·											2	Majo	or	3

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	3
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	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: EDUC 771 0101 University of Maryland Page 631 Title RESEARCH DESIGNS IN ED Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Instructor: OLIA, NEZHAT

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 5

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eauei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	Λ	Λ	2	1	2	4 00	1216/1670	2 17	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	1		1479/1666		4.45	4.27	4.34	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	0	2		1206/1406		4.50	4.32	4.36	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	υ Τ	0	2	2		1200/1400	3.40	4.51	4.24	4.33	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	706/1566		4.14	4.24	4.33	4.20
-		0	0	1	0	Τ	3	4.20	899/1528	3.48	4.14	4.12	4.20	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	∠ 3	4.00	973/1650		4.42	4.12	4.33	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		0	0	0	0	1	3 4		861/1667	4.78	4.43	4.22	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	,					4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	Т	U	U	2	Τ	Τ	3.75	1254/1626	3.33	4.27	4.11	4.20	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	1199/1559	3.69	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1326/1560	4.32	4.86	4.72	4.81	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	1027/1549	3.39	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1354/1546	3.06	4.43	4.32	4.40	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	590/1323		4.12	4.00	4.03	4.20
5. 214 addrevibadi ocomingado cimanoc your anderboanding	Ū	Ü	·	·	-	_	_	1.20	3707 1323	3.30		1.00	1.05	1120
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	975/1384	3.40	4.50	4.10	4.21	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	525/1378	4.01	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1165/1378	3.56	4.75	4.31	4.51	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	820/ 904	3.36	4.34	4.03	4.04	3.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utio	n									

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	2	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	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	5	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 771 8720 Title

RESEARCH DESIGNS IN ED

MURDOCK, JOHNN Instructor:

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 632 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

	- I			Instructor		Course Dept				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	2	3	7	4	1	2.94	1629/1670	3.47	4.48	4.31	4.46	2.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	3	7	1	3.06	1600/1666		4.45	4.27	4.34	3.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1406	3.75	4.50	4.32	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	6	3	2	3.00	1565/1615	3.40	4.51	4.24	4.33	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	4	3	6	0	2.75	1527/1566	3.48	4.14	4.07	4.20	2.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	7	5	1	3.06	1443/1528	3.53	4.42	4.12	4.33	3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	5	7	1	3.18	1557/1650	3.69	4.43	4.22	4.30	3.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	909/1667	4.78	4.83	4.67	4.74	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	0	7	3	0	2.92	1558/1626	3.33	4.27	4.11	4.20	2.92
T o who we														
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	0	5	7	1	2 10	1507/1559	3.69	4.59	4.46	4.49	3.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	2	5	Q I		1416/1560		4.86	4.72	4.49	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	5	3	4	4	1		1522/1549		4.53	4.31	4.37	2.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	2	5	2	2		1522/1546			4.32		2.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	4	0	2	2	1		1266/1323			4.00	4.03	
or big additional commission of all anderboanding	_	•	-	Ü	_	_	_	2.50	1200, 1323	3.30		1.00	1.05	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	6	2	3		1260/1384		4.50		4.21	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	3	1	4	4	5		1224/1378		4.68	4.29	4.42	3.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	1	4	6	4		1184/1378					3.53
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	1	0	2	6	2	3.73	643/ 904	3.36	4.34	4.03	4.04	3.73
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 87	****	4.68	4.65	4.61	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 79		4.43	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	,		4.61	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 79		4.47	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 80		4.40	3.97	4.32	****
or here driveria for grading made drear		Ü	_	Ü	_	Ü	Ü	2.00	, 33		1.10	3.77	1.52	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	3.57	4.64	4.82	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 16	****	4.17	4.67	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 27	****	4.67	4.54	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0 2	1	2	0	0	0		****/ 10	****	4.40	4.84	4.90	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students			0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	5.00	****
Errom		- D-1			_									

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	5 5	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: EDUC 781 8720 TEACHER LEADERSHIP SCHAFFER, EUGEN

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 14

16

University of Maryland Page 633 Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

12

responses to be significant

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fr 1	eque:	ncies	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	964/1670		4.48	4.31	4.46	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	751/1666	4.43	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	520/1615	4.54	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	510/1566	4.38	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	679/1528	4.29	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	1	9	4.36	782/1650	4.36	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	786/1667	4.85	4.83	4.67	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	278/1626	4.67	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.67
Lecture	_	_		_										
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	503/1559		4.59	4.46	4.49	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1560		4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	549/1549	4.62	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	482/1546		4.43	4.32	4.40	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	864/1323	3.85	4.12	4.00	4.03	3.85
Discussion						_			00= /4004					
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	235/1384		4.50	4.10	4.21	4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	368/1378	4.79	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	333/1378	4.86	4.75	4.31	4.51	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	210/ 904	4.58	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.58
Free	uency	y Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 8 0.00-0.99 0 A 11		Re	 guir	ed f	or Ma	 ajor	 s	0	Graduat	 e	4	 Majo		14
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3	Required for Majors										5 -			
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0	General					0	Under-grad 10			Non-	major	0		
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0									3				-	
Grad. 4 3.50-4.00 10 F 0	Electives							0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	rh

Other

Course-Section: EDUC 781S 2302 Title

TEACHER LEADERSHIP

Instructor: STAFF Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 634 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

	_			
Ctudant	('Ollred	Evaluation	Ougetion	naira

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	414/1670	4.71	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	138/1666	4.93	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	240/1406	4.83	4.50	4.32	4.36	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	141/1615	4.93	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	309/1566	4.64	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	97/1528	4.93	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.43	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	885/1667		4.83	4.67	4.74	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	255/1626	4.70	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	355/1559	4.86	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	185/1546	4.93	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	481/1323	4.33	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	14		1/1378	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	198/ 904		4.73		4.04	
4. Were special techniques successiul		U	U	U		5	,	1.02	100/ 004	1.02	1.51	1.03	1.01	7.02
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	3.21	4.21	4.53	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	3.82	4.44	4.69	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	4.10	4.31	4.58	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	3.83	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.68	4.65	4.61	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.43	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.61	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.47	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 80	****	4.40	3.97	4.32	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	12	U	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	/ 80		4.40	3.91	4.32	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.76	4.50	4.65	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.26	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.44	4.62	4.65	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.33	4.27	4.59	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.41	4.47	4.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 28	****	3.57	4.64	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 16	****	4.17	4.67	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.17	4.54	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 10	****	4.40	4.84	4.90	****
1. Mas the recursor/tutoring by proctors herpful	10	U	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	, 10		1.10	1.04	4.20	

Course-Section: EDUC 781S 2302 Title

TEACHER LEADERSHIP

Instructor: STAFF Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 634 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: EDUC 791P 0101

PRACTICUM IN ED SEC 7-

Title MURPHY, JOYCE A

Instructor: Enrollment:

8 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 635 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	363/1670	4.75	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	226/1406		4.50	4.32	4.36	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	423/1615	4.63	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	354/1566	4.57	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	368/1528	4.57	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	471/1650	4.57	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.50
Lecture		-	•	•	-	-	-	4 00	600/1202	4 00	4 10	4 00	4 00	4 00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	Τ	0	0	Τ	Τ	Τ	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	257/1384	4.75	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	312/1378	4.88	4.75	4.31	4.51	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	243/ 904	4.50	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.50
-1.11 m 1														
Field Work	_	0	•	_	•	-		4 00	05/ 41	4 00	4 56	4 50	4 65	4 00
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	25/ 41	4.80	4.76	4.50	4.65	4.80
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	Τ.	Ι	3	4.40	22/ 38		4.26	4.19	4.58	4.40
3. Was the instructor available for consultation		2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	4.44	4.62	4.65	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations		1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	17/ 39	4.50	4.33	4.27	4.59	4.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.41	4.47	4.59	5.00

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	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	5	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7	_			
					0						

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

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 6

0

1

84-150

Grad.

3.00-3.49 0

3.50-4.00 3

D 0

F 0

0

Р 0

I

? 0

5

Page 636 AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

					Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course Dept		. UMBC Leve		Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.46	5.00
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	233/1666		4.45	4.27	4.34	4.83
		estions reflec			0	5	0	0	0	0	1		****/1406		4.50	4.32	4.36	****
	_	ations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	552/1615		4.51	4.24	4.33	4.50
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	559/1566		4.14	4.07	4.20	4.33
	_	_		to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1528		4.42	4.12	4.33	4.83
		system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	2	1	3		1008/1650		4.43	4.22	4.30	4.17
		was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
	-			ching effectiveness	2	2 0 0 0 0					2	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.50
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were t	the instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1022/1559	4.40	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.40
2. Did th	he instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was le	ecture mat	erial presente	d and	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	816/1549	4.40	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.40
4. Did th	he lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1032/1546	4.20	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.20
5. Did a	udiovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	205/1384	4.83	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.83
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did th	he instruc	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		0					1	4.20	405/ 904	4.20	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.20	
				Frequ	ency Distribution													
Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	Reasons					3			Туј	уре		Majo:		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors			s 0 Grad		Graduat	е	1	Majo	r	6			
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0	G1			0 1		,	_							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General					0	Under-g	rad	5 Non-r		major	0		

Electives

Other

0

6

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 792L 0101 University of Maryland Title INT IN EDU TESOL K-12 Baltimore County Instructor: STEIN, HOLLIS G

Enrollment:

84-150

Grad.

0

3

Ouestionnaires: 7

7

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

0

2

D

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

0

0

Page 637 AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

0

3

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Ctudent	Course	Evaluation	Ougetionn	a i ra

				Fre	quer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ranl	2	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General																
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this co	urse	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	809/16	570	4.40	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected go	als	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	259/16	566	4.80	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected g	goals	2	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/14	106	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected go	als	2	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/16	515	5.00	4.51	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you	learned	2	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	566	****	4.14	4.07	4.20	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what yo	u learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	173/15	528	4.80	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		2	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	272/16	550	4.75	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled		2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1256/16	567	4.40	4.83	4.67	4.74	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effe	ctiveness	3	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1312/16	526	3.67	4.27	4.11	4.20	3.67
Seminar		_		•			_									
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announce		2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	53/	87	4.80	4.68	4.65	4.61	4.80
2. Was the instructor available for individual a		2	Ţ	0	0	0	Τ	3	4.75	47/	79	4.75	4.43	4.64	4.67	4.75
3. Did research projects contribute to what you		2	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/	75	5.00	4.61	4.57	4.66	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you lear:	nea	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	41/	79	4.60	4.47	4.45	4.58	4.60
5. Were criteria for grading made clear		2	Τ	0	U	0	Τ	3	4.75	20/	80	4.75	4.40	3.97	4.32	4.75
	Freque	ncy	Dist	ribu	ıtior	ı										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expect	ed Grades				Rea	sons	5				Тур	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A	3		Rec	uire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	 }	0	Gradı	iate		3	 Majo	 r	3
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B	0	Required for Majors										,				
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C	0	General					0	Under-grad 4			Non-	4				

Electives

Other

Course-Section: EDUC 793 2301 University of Maryland
Title INTERNSHIP IN EDUCATIO Baltimore County

Instructor: ZONGKER, SHIRLE

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 11

Spring 2008
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 638

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

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. O 0 1 0 1 4 4.33 799/1406 4.30 4.50 4.24 4.34 4.50 3. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Did uniterial prepared 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course had you learned 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this you learned 1. Did you gain new insights of the subject 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this you learned 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 6. D. O. O. D. D. S. D. D. Were 3. 379/1378 7. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 7. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 8. O. O. O. D. D. S. D. D. Were 4.77 A.78 A.79 A.75 A.71 A.75 A.75 A.76 A.77 A.75 A.76 A.77 A.75	Questions	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. O 0 1 0 1 4 4.33 799/1406 4.30 4.50 4.24 4.34 4.50 3. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Did uniterial prepared 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course had you learned 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this you learned 1. Did you gain new insights of the subject 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this you learned 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 6. D. O. O. D. D. S. D. D. Were 3. 379/1378 7. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 7. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 8. O. O. O. D. D. S. D. D. Were 4.77 A.78 A.79 A.75 A.71 A.75 A.75 A.76 A.77 A.75 A.76 A.77 A.75	Conoral														
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 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 8. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did assigned readings experiment to what you learned 1. O O O I O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O		1	0	Ο	0	Ο	3	7	4 70	440/1670	4 70	4 48	4 31	4 46	4 70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 4 0 1 0 1 4 4.33 799/1406 4.33 4.50 4.32 4.36 4.33 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 1 1 1 0 0 1 2 5 4.11 1018/1615 4.11 4.51 4.24 4.33 4.11 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 3 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 354/1566 4.57 4.14 4.07 4.20 4.57 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 1 3 6 4.50 42/1/528 4.50 4.42 4.12 4.33 4.50 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 6 4.50 42/1/528 4.50 4.42 4.12 4.33 4.50 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 7 4.60 1082/1667 4.60 4.83 4.67 4.74 4.60 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 637/1626 4.33 4.27 4.11 4.20 4.33 7. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 0 1 2 2 4.33 1092/1559 4.33 4.59 4.46 4.49 4.33 7. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 8 0 0 0 0 1 2 2 4.67 1090/1560 4.67 4.86 4.72 4.81 4.67 7. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1546 **** 4.43 4.32 4.40 **** 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1546 **** 4.43 4.32 4.40 **** 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 379/1378 4.78 4.68 4.29 4.42 4.78 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 379/1378 4.78 4.68 4.29 4.42 4.78 7. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 379/1378 4.78 4.68 4.29 4.42 4.78 7. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		_	•	0	0	•	3	6		-, -					
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 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 all students actively encouraged to participate 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. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 3. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 4. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 7. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 8. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 9. Did presentations cont		1	4	0				4		,					
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. 0 0 0 1 2 7 4.60 1082/1667 4.60 4.83 4.27 4.11 4.20 4.33 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Was allecture seem interested in the subject 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Were assigned reading system clearly encouraged to participate 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 4. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 7. O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O		1	1	1	0	1	2	5	4.11					4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 2 1 1 6 4.10 1079/1650 4.10 4.43 4.22 4.30 4.10 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 1 2 7 4.60 1082/1667 4.60 4.83 4.67 4.74 4.60 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 637/1626 4.33 4.27 4.11 4.20 4.33 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 1092/1559 4.33 4.59 4.46 4.49 4.33 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 8 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 1090/1560 4.67 4.86 4.72 4.81 4.67 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 9 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 5.00 ****/1549 **** 4.53 4.31 4.37 **** 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1545 **** 4.43 4.32 4.40 **** 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/1323 **** 4.12 4.00 4.03 **** Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 6 4.56 403/1384 4.56 4.50 4.10 4.21 4.56 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 379/1378 4.78 4.68 4.29 4.42 4.78 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 417/1378 4.78 4.68 4.29 4.42 4.78 4. Were special techniques successful 2 1 1 0 0 5 2 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 4.34 4.03 4.04 3.88 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 47/ 79 4.75 4.43 4.64 4.67 4.75 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 47/ 79 4.75 4.43 4.64 4.67 4.75 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 47/ 79 5.00 4.47 4.45 4.58 5.00 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 6 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 25/ 80 4.60 4.40 3.97 4.32 4.60		1	3	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	354/1566	4.57	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 1 2 7 4.60 1082/1667 4.60 4.83 4.67 4.74 4.60 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 637/1626 4.33 4.27 4.11 4.20 4.33 Lecture	6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.50
Lecture Lect	7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	1079/1650	4.10	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.10
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Did class discussions 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	8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	1082/1667	4.60	4.83	4.67	4.74	4.60
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	637/1626	4.33	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.33
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	Logturo														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 8 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 1090/1560 4.67 4.86 4.72 4.81 4.67 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1549 **** 4.53 4.31 4.37 **** 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1546 **** 4.43 4.32 4.40 **** 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/1323 **** 4.12 4.00 4.03 **** Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 1 2 6 4.56 403/1384 4.56 4.50 4.10 4.21 4.56 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 379/1378 4.78 4.68 4.29 4.42 4.78 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 417/1378 4.78 4.78 4.61 4.51 4.78 4. Were special techniques successful 2 1 1 0 0 5 2 3.88 580/904 3.88 4.34 4.03 4.04 3.88 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/87 5.00 4.68 4.65 4.61 5.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 1 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 47/79 4.75 4.43 4.64 4.67 4.75 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 41/75 4.75 4.61 4.57 4.66 4.75 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/79 5.00 4.47 4.45 4.58 5.00 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 6 0 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 25/80 4.60 4.40 3.97 4.32 4.60		Ω	Ο	Λ	Λ	1	Λ	2	4 33	1002/1550	4 33	4 50	1 16	1 10	4 33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1549 **** 4.53 4.31 4.37 **** 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1546 **** 4.43 4.32 4.40 **** 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/1323 **** 4.12 4.00 4.03 **** Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 1 2 6 4.56 403/1384 4.56 4.50 4.10 4.21 4.56 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 379/1378 4.78 4.68 4.29 4.42 4.78 4. Were special techniques successful 2 1 1 0 0 5 2 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 4.34 4.03 4.04 3.88 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/87 5.00 4.68 4.65 4.61 5.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 1 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 47/79 4.75 4.43 4.64 4.67 4.75 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 41/75 4.75 4.61 4.57 4.66 4.75 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4 5.00 1/79 5.00 4.47 4.45 4.58 5.00 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 6 0 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 25/80 4.60 4.40 3.97 4.32 4.60						0		2		,					
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1546 **** 4.43 4.32 4.40 **** 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/1323 **** 4.12 4.00 4.03 **** 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/1323 **** 4.12 4.00 4.03 **** 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 6 4.56 403/1384 4.56 4.50 4.10 4.21 4.56 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 379/1378 4.78 4.68 4.29 4.42 4.78 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 417/1378 4.78 4.75 4.31 4.51 4.78 4. Were special techniques successful 2 1 1 0 0 5 2 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 4.34 4.03 4.04 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 4.34 4.03 4.04 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 4.34 4.03 4.04 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 4.34 4.03 4.04 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 4.34 4.03 4.04 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 4.34 4.03 4.04 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 4.34 4.03 4.04 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 4.34 4.03 4.04 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 4.34 4.03 4.04 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 4.34 4.03 4.04 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 4.34 4.03 4.04 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 4.34 4.03 4.04 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 4.34 4.03 4.04 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 4.34 4.03 4.04 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 4.34 4.03 4.04 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 4.34 4.03 4.04 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 4.34 4.03 4.04 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 4.34 4.03 4.04 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88 580/ 904 3.88	g and a second and						_	2		,					
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 1 2 6 4.56 403/1384 4.56 4.50 4.10 4.21 4.56 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 379/1378 4.78 4.68 4.29 4.42 4.78 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful 3. Eminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 4. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6. Discussion 6. Discussion 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 7. Did Did Presentations contribute to what you learned 8. Did Presentations contribute to what you learned 9. Did Did Presentations contribute to what you learned 9. Did Did Presentations contribute to what you learned 9. Did							-	2		,					****
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 1 2 6 4.56 403/1384 4.56 4.50 4.10 4.21 4.56 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 379/1378 4.78 4.68 4.29 4.42 4.78 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 417/1378 4.78 4.75 4.31 4.51 4.78 4. Were special techniques successful 2 1 1 0 0 5 2 3.88 580/904 3.88 4.34 4.03 4.04 3.88 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/87 5.00 4.68 4.65 4.61 5.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 1 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 47/79 4.75 4.43 4.64 4.67 4.75 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 41/75 4.75 4.61 4.57 4.66 4.75 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/79 5.00 4.47 4.45 4.58 5.00 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 6 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 25/80 4.60 4.40 3.97 4.32 4.60	_		-				-	0		,	****				****
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 1 2 6 4.56 403/1384 4.56 4.50 4.10 4.21 4.56 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 379/1378 4.78 4.68 4.29 4.42 4.78 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 417/1378 4.78 4.75 4.31 4.51 4.78 4. Were special techniques successful 2 1 1 0 0 5 2 3.88 580/904 3.88 4.34 4.03 4.04 3.88 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/87 5.00 4.68 4.65 4.61 5.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 1 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 47/79 4.75 4.43 4.64 4.67 4.75 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 41/75 4.75 4.61 4.57 4.66 4.75 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/79 5.00 4.47 4.45 4.58 5.00 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 6 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 25/80 4.60 4.40 3.97 4.32 4.60															
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 379/1378 4.78 4.68 4.29 4.42 4.78 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 417/1378 4.78 4.75 4.31 4.51 4.78 4. Were special techniques successful 2 1 1 0 0 5 2 3.88 580/904 3.88 4.34 4.03 4.04 3.88 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/87 5.00 4.68 4.65 4.61 5.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 1 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 47/79 4.75 4.43 4.64 4.67 4.75 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 41/75 4.75 4.61 4.57 4.66 4.75 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/79 5.00 4.47 4.45 4.58 5.00 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 6 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 25/80 4.60 4.40 3.97 4.32 4.60															
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful 2. 0. 0. 0. 0. 2. 7. 4.78. 417/1378. 4.78. 4.75. 4.31. 4.51. 4.78. 4. Were special techniques successful 2. 1. 1. 0. 0. 5. 2. 3.88. 580/904. 3.88. 4.34. 4.03. 4.04. 3.88. Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 5. 5.00. 1/87. 5.00. 4.68. 4.65. 4.61. 5.00. 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6. 1. 0. 0. 0. 1. 3. 4.75. 47/79. 4.75. 4.43. 4.64. 4.67. 4.75. 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 7. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 1. 3. 4.75. 41/75. 4.75. 4.61. 4.57. 4.66. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.75. 4.7				-		1		-		,					
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/87 5.00 4.68 4.65 4.61 5.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 1 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 47/79 4.75 4.43 4.64 4.67 4.75 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 41/75 4.75 4.61 4.57 4.66 4.75 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4 5.00 1/79 5.00 4.47 4.45 4.58 5.00 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 6 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 25/80 4.60 4.40 3.97 4.32 4.60							2	7		,					
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/87 5.00 4.68 4.65 4.61 5.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 1 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 47/79 4.75 4.43 4.64 4.67 4.75 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 41/75 4.75 4.61 4.57 4.66 4.75 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/79 5.00 4.47 4.45 4.58 5.00 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 6 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 25/80 4.60 4.40 3.97 4.32 4.60	-		0	0			2	7		,					
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/87 5.00 4.68 4.65 4.61 5.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 1 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 47/79 4.75 4.43 4.64 4.67 4.75 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 41/75 4.75 4.61 4.57 4.66 4.75 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/79 5.00 4.47 4.45 4.58 5.00 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 6 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 25/80 4.60 4.40 3.97 4.32 4.60	4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	1	0	0	5	2	3.88	580/ 904	3.88	4.34	4.03	4.04	3.88
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 1 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 47/ 79 4.75 4.43 4.64 4.67 4.75 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 41/ 75 4.75 4.61 4.57 4.66 4.75 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 79 5.00 4.47 4.45 4.58 5.00 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 6 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 25/ 80 4.60 4.40 3.97 4.32 4.60	Seminar														
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 41/75 4.75 4.61 4.57 4.66 4.75 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 79 5.00 4.47 4.45 4.58 5.00 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 6 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 25/80 4.60 4.40 3.97 4.32 4.60	1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	4.68	4.65	4.61	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/ 79 5.00 4.47 4.45 4.58 5.00 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 6 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 25/ 80 4.60 4.40 3.97 4.32 4.60	2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	47/ 79	4.75	4.43	4.64	4.67	4.75
5. Were criteria for grading made clear 6 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 25/ 80 4.60 4.40 3.97 4.32 4.60	3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	41/ 75	4.75	4.61	4.57	4.66	4.75
	4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.47	4.45	4.58	5.00
Frequency Distribution	5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	25/ 80	4.60	4.40	3.97	4.32	4.60
· 1··· · · 1	Frequ	.ency	Dist	rib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	Chadita Farmed Chim CDA Francisco Curden				D.c.					m				Mo ion-	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	L	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	А	8	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	8	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7	-			
				?	0						

University of Maryland ISD PROJECT SEMINAR Baltimore County

Course-Section: EDUC 794 0101 Page 639 Title AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Instructor: KINERNEY, DONNA Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires:	5	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Enrollment:

5

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1566/1670	3.40	4.48	4.31	4.46	3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1037/1666	4.20	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	446/1615	4.60	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	1549/1566	2.25	4.14	4.07	4.20	2.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1122/1528	3.80	4.42	4.12	4.33	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1503/1650	3.40	4.43	4.22	4.30	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	63/ 87	4.60	4.68	4.65	4.61	4.60
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	69/ 79	4.00	4.43	4.64	4.67	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	37/ 75	4.80	4.61	4.57	4.66	4.80
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	68/ 79	3.80	4.47	4.45	4.58	3.80
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	59/ 80	3.40	4.40	3.97	4.32	3.40

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

Course-Section: EDUC 798 2321 University of Maryland Title INTERN SEMIN IN ELEM E

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 640

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: BOURNE, BARBARA Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 4 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	2	2	4.50	665/16	70	4.50	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	312/16		4.75	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	597/14		4.50	4.50	4.32	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	874/16		4.25		4.24	4.33	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	1	1		1478/15		3.00	4.14	4.07	4.20	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	706/15		4.25	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	,		4.50	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2		1157/16		4.50		4.67	4.74	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	953/16		4.00		4.11		4.00
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	896/15		4.50	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/15		5.00	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1		4.50			4.50	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	0		1139/15		4.00	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1179/13	23	3.00	4.12	4.00	4.03	3.00
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/13	84	4.67	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/13	78	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/13	78	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	179/ 9	04	4.67	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.67
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	69/	87	4.33	4.68	4.65	4.61	4.33
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33		79	4.33		4.64		4.33
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2		4.33		75	4.33	4.61	4.57	4.66	4.33
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67		79	4.67	4.47	4.45	4.58	4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	,	80	4.67		3.97		
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/	41	5.00	4.76	4.50	4.65	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00		38	5.00	4.26	4.19	4.58	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	32/	38	4.33	4.44	4.62	4.65	4.33
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	21/	39	4.33		4.27	4.59	4.33
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	19/	31	4.33	4.41	4.47	4.59	4.33
_		<u> </u>	.,												

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