Course-Section: EDUC 216 0101 University of Maryland Title

FOUNDATIONS OF LEADERS LENNON, NICHOLA (Instr. A)

Instructor: Enrollment: 20

Spring 2009

Ρ

I

0

0

Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Baltimore County

Page 570 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

								-										
							Fre	eque	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did	vou gain n	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	1027/1576	4.18	4.42	4.30	4.35	4.18
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	555/1576		4.37	4.27	4.32	4.55
3. Did	the exam q	uestions reflect	the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.68	4.32	4.41	4.00
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	998/1520	4.09	4.46	4.25	4.26	4.09
5. Did	assigned r	eadings contrib	ate to	what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	596/1465	4.30	4.29	4.12	4.09	4.30
6. Did	written as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	836/1434	4.10	4.37	4.14	4.06	4.10
7. Was	the gradin	g system clearly	y expla	ained	1	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	690/1547	4.40	4.24	4.19	4.22	4.40
8. How	many times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	665/1574	4.80	4.80	4.64	4.62	4.80
9. How	would you	grade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	772/1554	4.15	4.08	4.10	4.05	4.15
		Lecture	e															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lectures	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.58	4.47	4.44	4.50
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	557/1493		4.80	4.73	4.75	4.90
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	561/1486	4.55	4.43	4.32	4.29	4.55
4. Did	the lectur	es contribute to	what	you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	921/1489	4.25	4.39	4.32	4.31	4.25
5. Did	audiovisua	l techniques en	nance y	your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	309/1277	4.45	4.10	4.03	4.01	4.45
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class disc	ussions contrib	ite to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	400/1279	4.57	4.53	4.17	4.14	4.57
2. Were	all stude	nts actively end	courage	ed to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	458/1270	4.71	4.69	4.35	4.30	4.71
3. Did	the instru	ctor encourage :	fair an	nd open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	332/1269	4.86	4.73	4.35	4.29	4.86
4. Were	special t	echniques succe	ssful		4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	122/ 878	4.86	4.36	4.05	3.92	4.86
		Semina	c															
5. Were	criteria	for grading made	e clear	:	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	***	4.22	4.01	4.21	****
		Self 1	Paced															
5. Were	there eno	ugh proctors for	r all t	the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	***	5.00	4.08	4.39	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
O		Grow GDA		Demonstrad Consider				Da					m				M = + =	
Credits		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades					asons	; -			Ту:	 be			Majors 	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B 5		~		,					1	, .	-			1.1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 1		Gei	nera:	T				7	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	-major	11
84-150		3.00-3.49	1	D 0								0			,			,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1	Means t	nere a	re not	enoug	ın

Other

0

Course-Section: EDUC 216 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Title FOUNDATIONS OF LEADERS Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment:

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 571 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires: 11 Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 1 4 5 4.18 1027/1576 4.18 4.42 4.30 4.35 4.18 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 5 6 4.55 555/1576 4.55 4.37 4.27 4.32 4.55 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 4 3 4 4.00 972/1342 4.00 4.68 4.32 4.41 4.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 0 1 4 5 4.09 998/1520 4.09 4.46 4.25 4.26 4.09 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 0 4 5 4.30 596/1465 4.30 4.29 4.12 4.09 4.30 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 2 2 5 4.10 836/1434 4.10 4.37 4.14 4.06 4.107. Was the grading system clearly explained $1 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 0 \quad 3 \quad 6 \quad 4.40 \quad 690/1547 \quad 4.40 \quad 4.24 \quad 4.19 \quad 4.22 \quad 4.40$ 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 2 8 4.80 665/1574 4.80 4.80 4.64 4.62 4.80 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 1 1 4 4 4.10 871/1554 4.15 4.08 4.10 4.05 4.15Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 870/1488 4.50 4.58 4.47 4.44 4.50 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 9 4.90 557/1493 4.90 4.80 4.73 4.75 4.90 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 0 2 7 4.50 678/1486 4.55 4.43 4.32 4.29 4.55 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 2 1 6 4.20 997/1489 4.25 4.39 4.32 4.31 4.25 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 6 4 4.40 404/1277 4.45 4.10 4.03 4.01 4.45 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 400/1279 4.57 4.53 4.17 4.14 4.57 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 458/1270 4.71 4.69 4.35 4.30 4.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 332/1269 4.86 4.73 4.35 4.29 4.86 4. Were special techniques successful 4 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 122/ 878 4.86 4.36 4.05 3.92 4.86

Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 375 **** 4.22 4.01 4.21 ****

Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 382 **** 5.00 4.08 4.39 ****

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

Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION

Instructor: BOURNE, BARBARA

Enrollment:

9 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 572 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			
× · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	277/1576	4.70	4.42	4.30	4.30	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	166/1576	4.79	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1342	4.81		4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1520	4.86		4.25	4.25	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9		1/1465	4.88	4.29	4.12	4.09	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	5.00	1/1434	4.91		4.14	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.89	135/1547	4.82		4.19	4.21	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3		4.67	911/1574	4.61		4.64	4.61	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1		4.86	138/1554			4.10		4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	Τ		U	U	U	Τ	O	4.00	130/1334	4.00	4.00	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	278/1488	4.76	4.58	4.47	4.47	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.47	4.47	5.00
•	0	0	0	0	0	0	9			4.84	4.43		4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1486 1/1489					
		1	0	0					,	4.78	4.39	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	Т	U	U	0	0	8	5.00	1/1277	4.79	4.10	4.03	4.11	5.00
Discussion	-	0	•	•	0	•	0	F 00	1 /1 000	4 00	4 50	4 1 1	4 00	F 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1279	4.88		4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1270	4.75	4.69	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	179/ 878	4.59	4.36	4.05	4.09	4.63
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 234	****	3.08	4.23	4.24	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.47	4.35	4.32	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.16	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	5.00	4.20	4.17	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.41	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 72	****	4.46	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.31	4.61	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.22	4.01	4.12	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	5.00	4.79	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	4.88	4.41	4.40	3.92	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	4.88	4.65	4.73	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	5.00	4.39	4.57	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 326	4.75	4.58	4.03	4.23	5.00
	-	-	-		-	-	-		,					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.25	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 35	****	4.08	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	_		****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.24	****
1 State of the state of t	•	·	J	Ū	•	ŭ	_	2.00	, 302		3.00	1.00		

Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION

Instructor: BOURNE, BARBARA

Enrollment: 9
Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 572 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION

Instructor: DANNA, S Enrollment:

21 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 573 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Cour	rse Evaluation	Questionnaire
--------------	----------------	---------------

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	471/1576	4.70	4.42	4.30	4.30	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	364/1576	4.79	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	455/1342	4.81	4.68	4.32	4.30	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	291/1520	4.86	4.46	4.25	4.25	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	206/1465	4.88	4.29	4.12	4.09	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	146/1434	4.91	4.37	4.14	4.15	4.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	238/1547	4.82	4.24	4.19	4.21	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	1033/1574	4.61	4.80	4.64	4.61	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	449/1554	4.66	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	722/1488	4.76	4.58	4.47	4.47	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	437/1486	4.84	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	625/1489	4.78	4.39	4.32	4.34	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	273/1277	4.79	4.10	4.03	4.11	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	262/1279	4.88	4.53	4.17	4.20	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	636/1270	4.75	4.69	4.35	4.42	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	204/ 878	4.59	4.36	4.05	4.09	4.56
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.79	4.48	4.37	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	25/ 48	4.88	4.41	4.40	3.92	4.88
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	29/ 44	4.88	4.65	4.73	4.63	4.88
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	4.39	4.57	4.50	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	4	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	145/ 326	4.75	4.58	4.03	4.23	4.50

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

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

Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI Enrollment: 24 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questionnaires: 18

Baltimore	County	JUL	2,	2009	
Spring	2009	Job	IRBF	3029	

Page 574

			Fre	equei	ncies	5		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	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	485/1576	4.14	4.42	4.30	4.30	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	698/1576	4.46	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	770/1342	4.23	4.68	4.32	4.30	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	707/1520	4.39	4.46	4.25	4.25	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	606/1465	3.79	4.29	4.12	4.09	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	138/1434	4.45	4.37	4.14	4.15	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	217/1547	4.49	4.24	4.19	4.21	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	1041/1574	4.74	4.80	4.64	4.61	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	584/1554	4.02	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	355/1488	4.82	4.58	4.47	4.47	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	334/1493	4.87	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	191/1486	4.84	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	274/1489	4.68	4.39	4.32	4.34	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	366/1277	4.42	4.10	4.03	4.11	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	0	2	10	4.36	589/1279	3.89	4.53	4.17	4.20	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	378/1270	4.46	4.69	4.35	4.42	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	222/1269	4.68	4.73	4.35	4.41	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	294/ 878	4.19	4.36	4.05	4.09	4.38
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	***

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	В	1						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	15	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 311 0201 University of Maryland Title PSYC FOUNDATION OF EDU Baltimore County

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI

Enrollment: 21
Ouestionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 575 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 1 5 3 5 3.67 1383/1576 4.14 4.42 4.30 4.30 3.67 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 6 8 4.47 668/1576 4.46 4.37 4.27 4.28 4.47 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 0 2 5 7 4.13 918/1342 4.23 4.68 4.32 4.30 4.13 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 5 8 4.40 683/1520 4.39 4.46 4.25 4.25 4.40 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 3 1 4 1 5 3.29 1331/1465 3.79 4.29 4.12 4.09 3.29 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 3 5 6 4.07 852/1434 4.45 4.37 4.14 4.15 4.07 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 2 2 2 9 4.20 900/1547 4.49 4.24 4.19 4.21 4.20 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 14 4.93 328/1574 4.74 4.80 4.64 4.61 4.93 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 0 0 4 4 1 3.67 1227/1554 4.02 4.08 4.10 4.09 3.67 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 1 13 4.80 401/1488 4.82 4.58 4.47 4.47 4.80 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 1 13 4.80 810/1493 4.87 4.80 4.73 4.70 4.80 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 1 13 4.80 271/1486 4.84 4.43 4.32 4.32 4.80 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 3 10 4.53 660/1489 4.68 4.39 4.32 4.34 4.53 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 3 3 9 4.40 404/1277 4.42 4.10 4.03 4.11 4.40 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 1 3 1 2 3.43 1097/1279 3.89 4.53 4.17 4.20 3.43 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 1 1 1 4 4.14 881/1270 4.46 4.69 4.35 4.42 4.14 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 711/1269 4.68 4.73 4.35 4.41 4.43 4. Were special techniques successful 9 0 0 0 2 2 2 4.00 464/878 4.19 4.36 4.05 4.09 4.00 Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 326 **** 4.58 4.03 4.23 **** Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/382 5.00 5.00 4.08 4.24 5.00 Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Course-Section: EDUC 313 0101 Title PEER ASSISTED LRNING I Baltimore County BICHY, CASSIE J

Spring 2009

Instructor:	B.
Enwellment:	

4 Enrollment: Questionnaires: 2

Page 576 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course I	valuation	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
Gamana l														
General	•	0	0	0	•	-	-	4 50	625/1556	4 50	4 40	4 20	4 20	4 50
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	1	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.42	4.30		4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1		1138/1576	4.00	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.46	4.25	4.25	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1242/1465	3.50	4.29	4.12	4.09	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.37	4.14	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.24	4.19	4.21	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1303/1554	3.50	4.08	4.10	4.09	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.58	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.10	4.03	4.11	5.00
1									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.53	4.17	4.20	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.36	4.05	4.09	5.00
				_	-	_	_		,					

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

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

Enrollment:

4

Baltimore County Spring 2009 JUL 2, 2009 Title BICHY, CASSIE J Job IRBR3029 Instructor:

Page 577

Questionnaires: 2 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	Questionnaires:	2	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------------------------------------------------------	-----------------	---	----------------	------------	---------------

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.42	4.30	4.30	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.46	4.25	4.25	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1242/1465	3.50	4.29	4.12	4.09	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.37	4.14	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.24	4.19	4.21	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1303/1554	3.50	4.08	4.10	4.09	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.58	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.10	4.03	4.11	5.00
Discussion														
	0	0	0	0	0	1	-	4 50	445 /1070	4 50	4.53	4 1 7	4 00	4 50
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	Ţ	Τ	4.50	445/1279	4.50		4.17	4.20	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270 1/1269	5.00	4.69 4.73	4.35	4.42 4.41	5.00 5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00 5.00	4.73	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	U	U	U	U	U	U	4	5.00	1/ 0/8	5.00	4.30	4.05	4.09	5.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	ı									

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

Course-Section: EDUC 388 0101 University of Maryland Title INCLUSION & INSTRUCTIO Baltimore County

INCLUSION & INSTRUCTIO Baltimore County DANNA, SANDRA Spring 2009

Instructor: DANNA, SAN

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 578 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	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	Ω	3	11	4.79	266/1576	4.79	4.42	4.30	4.30	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	244/1576	4.79	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	311/1520	4.69	4.46	4.25	4.25	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.29	4.12	4.09	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	226/1434	4.71	4.37	4.14	4.15	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	280/1547	4.71	4.24	4.19	4.21	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	832/1574	4.71	4.80	4.64	4.61	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	558/1554	4.38	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	Λ	2	9	4.75	505/1488	4.75	4.58	4.47	4.47	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	734/1493	4.83	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	339/1486	4.75	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	378/1489	4.75	4.39	4.32	4.34	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	608/1277	4.17	4.10	4.03	4.11	4.17
<b>-</b> 1														
Discussion	4	0	^	^	0	1	0	4 00	160/1070	4 00	4 52	4 1 7	4 00	4 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	169/1279	4.90	4.53	4.17	4.20	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	Τ	8	4.70	478/1270	4.70	4.69	4.35	4.42	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4 4	2	0	0	0	2	8 6	4.80	386/1269 139/ 878	4.80 4.75	4.73 4.36	4.35	4.41	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	4	۷	U	U	U	2	О	4.75	139/ 8/8	4.75	4.30	4.05	4.09	4.75
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	***	4.22	4.01	4.12	****
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	ı									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sid	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-			
				?	0						

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

Instructor: NORTH-COLEMAN,

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 10

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 579 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean			
General					_		_					4 00		4 40
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	787/1576			4.30	4.46	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	350/1576	3.54	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	480/1342	4.60	4.68	4.32	4.46	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	805/1520	4.15	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	596/1465	3.86	4.29	4.12	4.22	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	748/1434	3.79	4.37	4.14	4.30	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	527/1547	3.44	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	5		1041/1574	4.40	4.80	4.64		4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	772/1554	3.24	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4 30	1072/1488	3.71	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	810/1493	3.53	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.30			4.43	4.73	4.41	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	813/1489		4.39	4.32	4.38	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	404/1277	3.34		4.03	4.04	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	U	U	U	2	۷	O	4.40	404/12//	3.34	4.10	4.03	4.04	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	296/1279	3.77	4.53	4.17	4.31	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	458/1270	3.52	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	332/1269	4.26	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	197/ 878	3.99	4.36	4.05	4.33	4.57
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	34/ 52		4.79	4.48	4.70	4.75
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	27/ 48	3.42	4.41	4.40	4.30	4.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44		4.65	4.73	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	1.33	4.39	4.57	4.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	4.58	4.03	3.97	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 410 0201 READ CONTNT AREA I

Ρ

Ι

0

0 0

Title Instructor: WILLIAMS, NICOL

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 8

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 580 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
--	---------	--------	------------	---------------

							Fr	eauei	ncies	3		Ins	tructo	r	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ra	_	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1																
1 Did vo	nı gain n	ew insights,ski		this course	0	0	0	2	5	1	0	2 88	1552/	1576	3.64	4.42	4.30	4.46	2.88
_	-	ctor make clear			0	0	1	3	4	0	0		1570/		3.54	4.37	4.27	4.35	2.38
		uestions reflec	_	_	0	7	0	1	0	0	0		****/			4.68	4.32	4.46	****
	_	uations reflect			0	0	0	0	2	4	2		1041/		4.15	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.00
				hat you learned	1	0	1	0	2	3	1		1282/		3.86	4.29	4.12	4.22	3.43
	_			what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	2			1274/			4.37	4.14	4.30	3.38
		g system clearl		-	0	0	3	2	1	1	1		1523/		3.44	4.24	4.19	4.24	2.38
	-	was class canc		nea	0	0	0	0	1	4	3		1324/			4.80	4.64	4.69	4.25
	-			ing effectiveness	1	0	1	3	3	0					3.24		4.10		
9. HOW WO	outa you	grade the overa	ii teacii	ing effectiveness	1	U		3	3	U	U	2.29	1540/	1334	3.24	4.00	4.10	4.24	2.29
		Lectur																	
		uctor's lecture	_	_	0	0	1	0	4	3	0		1444/		3.71	4.58	4.47	4.55	3.13
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested in	the subject	0	0	2	4	1	0	1	2.25	1493/	1493	3.53	4.80	4.73	4.80	2.25
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and ex	plained clearly	0	0	2	2	3	1	0	2.38	1477/	1486	3.34	4.43	4.32	4.41	2.38
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what y	ou learned	0	0	4	1	3	0	0	1.88	1484/	1489	3.14	4.39	4.32	4.38	1.88
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance yo	ur understanding	0	1	3	2	0	1	1	2.29	1255/	1277	3.34	4.10	4.03	4.04	2.29
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cl	ass disc			hat you learned	2	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	1221/	1279	3.77	4.53	4.17	4.31	2.83
				to participate	2	0	2	1	2	1	0		1255/		3.52	4.69	4.35	4.53	2.33
		-	_	open discussion	2	0	1	0	1	2	2		1067/		4.26	4.73	4.35		3.67
		echniques succe		open arbeablen	2	1	0	1	1	3		3.40	742/			4.36	4.05		3.40
		Semina	r																
5. Were c	riteria	for grading mad			6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/	375	5.00	4.22	4.01	3.90	5.00
		Field	Mowle																
1 Did fi	old ormo	rience contribu		at ron learned	5	0	2	0	0	0	1	2 22	EO /	E 2	2 E1	4.79	1 10	4 70	2 22
						0	2		0	0	1		50/	52	3.54		4.48	4.70	2.33
		y understand yo			5			0	1				47/		3.42	4.41	4.40	4.30	2.33
		ctor available			5	1	1	0		0	0	2.00	44/			4.65	4.73	4.60	2.00
	_	could you disc	_		5	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	45/			4.39	4.57		1.33
5. Dia co	nierence	s help you carr	y out II	eld activities	4	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	326	****	4.58	4.03	3.97	****
		Self																	
5. Were t	here eno	ugh proctors fo	r all th	e students	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/	382	5.00	5.00	4.08	3.88	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re:	asons	2				Ту	ne			Majors	•
										- - – –									
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0 0	A 5 B 2		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Gra	duat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	-	1.00-1.99				<b>a</b>		1				^	TT== -7			0	Marr		0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	Т				0	und	er-g	rad	8	Non-	-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0								0	0.0.0			. 1			.1-
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0			F 0		Εle	ecti [.]	ves				0	###	# - l	Means t	here a		_	lu

Other

7

responses to be significant

Title ANALYSIS OF TCHNG & LR

Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI

Enrollment:

Spring 2009 25 Questionnaires: 17

Page 581 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	2	6	7	3.94	1203/1576	3.97	4.42	4.30	4.46	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	900/1576	4.40	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1342	4.33	4.68	4.32	4.46	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	376/1520	4.48	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	3	3	7	3.93	947/1465	4.01	4.29	4.12	4.22	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.37	4.14	4.30	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	575/1547	4.53	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	2	13		1018/1574		4.80	4.64	4.69	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	881/1554	4.23	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	505/1488	4.71	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	632/1493		4.80	4.73	4.80	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	3		4.56	607/1486		4.43	4.32	4.41	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	4	11		696/1489	4.58	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	385/1277	4.55	4.10	4.03	4.04	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	350/1279	4.70	4.53	4.17	4.31	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	523/1270	4.76	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	409/1269	4.77	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	245/ 878	4.56	4.36	4.05	4.33	4.46
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 234	***	3.08	4.23	4.28	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	****	3.47	4.35	4.45	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.70	****
Seminar							_							
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85	****	4.41	4.72	4.77	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 72	****	4.46	4.64	4.64	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	4.31	4.61	4.52	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	****/ 375	^^^	4.22	4.01	3.90	* * * *
Field Work	10	0	-	0	0	-	0	2 55	****	de de de de	4 50	4 40	4 50	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.73	****/ 52	****	4.79	4.48	4.70	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 48		4.41	4.40	4.30	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13 13	1 0	0	0 1	0	1 0	2		****/ 44 ****/ 45	****	4.65	4.73	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 326	****	4.39 4.58	4.57 4.03	4.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	U	U	U	1	۷	4.07	/ 320		4.30	4.03	3.97	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40	****	4.25	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.08	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	3.88	* * * *

Title ANALYSIS OF TCHNG & LR

Instructor:

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 17

Baltimore County WILLIAMS, VICKI Spring 2009

Page 581 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	_			
				?	0						

Title ANALYSIS OF TCHNG & LR

Instructor: SINGER, JONATHA

Enrollment: 12

10

Questionnaires: 12

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 582 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			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	1	0	1	6	4	4.00	1148/1576	3.97	4.42	4.30	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	608/1576	4.40	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	770/1342	4.33	4.68	4.32	4.46	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6		4.33	768/1520	4.48		4.25	4.38	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	808/1465	4.01	4.29	4.12	4.22	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2		4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.37	4.14	4.30	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	434/1547	4.53	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4		4.67			4.80			4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	571/1554	4.23	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	666/1488	4.71	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.83	734/1493	4.85	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	584/1486	4.57	4.43	4.32		4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	-	4.67	500/1489	4.58	4.39		4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	3	-	4.67	215/1277				4.04	
5. Fig additional committees committee four anderstanding	_	_	ŭ	Ü	Ü	J	ŭ	1.07	213, 12	1.00	1110	1.05	1.01	1.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2		4.75	262/1279	4.70	4.53	4.17	4.31	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	288/1270	4.76	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2		4.75	444/1269	4.77	4.73			4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	164/ 878	4.56	4.36	4.05	4.33	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 234	****	3.08	4.23	4.28	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 240	****	3.47	4.35	4.45	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.70	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.56	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 379	****	5.00	4.20		****
o. Here requirements for tab reports creating specifical		Ü	ŭ	ŭ	Ü	_	Ü	1.00	, 3.5		3.00	1120	,	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.41	4.72	4.77	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 72	****	4.46	4.64	4.64	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.31	4.61	4.52	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.79	4.48	4.70	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48	****	4.41	4.40	4.30	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.65	4.73	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 45	****	4.39	4.57		****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 40	****	4.25	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 35	****	4.08	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	3.88	****

Title ANALYSIS OF TCHNG & LR

Instructor:

SINGER, JONATHA

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 12 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 582 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: EDUC 414 0101 University of Maryland ADOLESCENT LITERATURE

Page 583 Baltimore County Spring 2009 Title JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: STOVER, LOIS (Instr. A)

Enrollment:	4			
Questionnaires:	3	Student Cour	se Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.42	4.30	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	851/1576	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	768/1520	4.33	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.29	4.12	4.22	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.37	4.14	4.30	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1396/1547	3.33	4.24	4.19	4.24	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.80	4.64	4.69	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	666/1488	4.58	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	891/1486	4.17	4.43	4.32	4.41	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	888/1489	4.17	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	4.50	4.10	4.03	4.04	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.53	4.17	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.36	4.05	4.33	5.00
Freque	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	ı									

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

Course-Section: EDUC 414 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County ADOLESCENT LITERATURE

Page 584 Title JUL 2, 2009 Instructor: NORTH-COLEMAN, (Instr. B) Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	4			
Questionnaires:	3	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	anier	ncies	3		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		Mean
G														
General	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.42	4.30	1 10	4.67
<ol> <li>Did you gain new insights, skills from this course</li> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> </ol>	0	0	0	0	1	Τ	2	4.67	851/1576	4.67	4.42	4.30	4.46 4.35	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	768/1520	4.33	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1465		4.29	4.12	4.22	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434		4.37	4.14	4.30	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	٥		1396/1547	3.33	4.24	4.19	4.24	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	911/1574		4.80	4.64	4.69	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	924/1554		4.08	4.10	4.24	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		U	U	U	U	2	U	4.00	924/1334	4.00	4.00	4.10	4.24	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	870/1488	4.58	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1101/1486	4.17	4.43	4.32	4.41	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1118/1489	4.17	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	692/1277	4.50	4.10	4.03	4.04	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.53	4.17	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.36	4.05	4.33	5.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	1									

Credits Ea	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	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	3	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sid	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 416 0101 University of Maryland Page 585
Title MATERIALS TCH READ Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Instructor: YOUNG, PATRICIA Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 9

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Ρ

I

0

0

Questionnaires: 9

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 I															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil		om this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	988/1576	4.22	4.42	4.30	4.46	4.22
_	-	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	542/1576	4.56	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.56
		uestions reflect			0	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.68	4.32	4.46	4.67
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	614/1520	4.44	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.44
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	264/1465	4.67	4.29	4.12	4.22	4.67
	-	-		to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	360/1434	4.56	4.37	4.14	4.30	4.56
		g system clearly		-	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	871/1547	4.22	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.22
		was class cance	_		1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	972/1574	4.63	4.80	4.64	4.69	4.63
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overal	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.00
		Lecture	2															
1 Woro +	ho inatr	uctor's lectures		propared	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.50
		ctor seem intere			3	0	0	0	1	0	- <del>1</del>		1053/1493	4.67	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.67
				explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	891/1486	4.33	4.43	4.32	4.41	4.33
		es contribute to			3	0	0	1	0	2	3		1020/1489	4.17	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.17
				your understanding	3	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	608/1277	4.17	4.10	4.03		4.17
			_															
		Discuss			_		_	_		_	_							
				what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.53	4.17	4.31	
		_	_	ed to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	2		827/1270		4.69	4.35	4.53	4.25
		-		nd open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	0	2		928/1269	4.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.00
4. Were s	special to	echniques succes	sstul		5	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.36	4.05	4.33	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	ı									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	oe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors		0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55 56-83	0 2	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0 0	B 2 C 0		Con	neral	1				0	Under-g	wa d	9	Moss	mo i o	9
84-150	1	3.00-2.99		D 0		Ger	ierd.	L				U	onder-g.	Lau	J	NOI1-	major	פ
84-150 Grad.	0	3.00-3.49	2 3	D 0 F 0		רים.	ectiv	700				0	#### - 1	Moana +	horo o	ro not	onomo	rh
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	3	U T		₽T€	SCLI	ves				U		weans t			_	ÌII

Other

8

responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 418 0101 University of Maryland Title

INSTRUCTION OF READING SHELTON, NANCY

Instructor: Enrollment: 11

Spring 2009 Questionnaires: 9

Page 586 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionn	aire
---------------	--------------	-----------	------

Baltimore County

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	568/1576	4.56	4.42	4.30	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	1	3	3.78	1303/1576		4.37	4.27	4.35	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	453/1520		4.46	4.25	4.38	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	571/1465	4.33	4.29	4.12	4.22	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	594/1434	4.33	4.37	4.14	4.30	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	2	1	2	0	2.11	1537/1547	2.11	4.24	4.19	4.24	2.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.80	4.64	4.69	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	355/1488	4.83	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	241/1486	4.83	4.43	4.32	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	500/1489	4.67		4.32		
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	215/1277		4.10	4.03	4.04	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	Λ	0	1	2	4.75	262/1279	4.75	4.53	4.17	4.31	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	3		412/1270		4.69	4.35	4.53	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/ 878			4.05	4.33	
mini di manda														
Field Work	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4 50	****/ 52	****	4.79	4.48	4.70	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	/	•	-	-	-	Τ	Τ		, -					****
Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria     Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	2 0	0	0		****/ 48 ****/ 44		4.41 4.65	4.40	4.30 4.60	****
	7	1	0	0	1	0	0	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.65	4.73	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	U	0	0	U T	0	2		****/ 326		4.58	4.57	3.97	****
5. Did conterences help you carry out freed activities	,	U	U	U	U	U	۷	5.00	/ 320		4.58	4.03	3.7/	
_		<u> </u>												

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: EDUC 419 0101

1

ASSESS READING

SHELTON, NANCY

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

Page 587 JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

		ionnaire

	Frequencies							Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	4.90	4.42	4.30	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	4.60	4.37	4.27	4.35	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	4.90	4.46	4.25	4.38	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	4.10	4.29	4.12	4.22	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.90	4.37	4.14	4.30	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1459/1547	3.60	4.24	4.19	4.24	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.69	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	4.67	4.53	4.17	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	799/ 878	3.67	4.36	4.05	4.33	3.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.79	4.48	4.70	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.41	4.40	4.30	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.65	4.73	4.60	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	38/ 45	4.00	4.39	4.57	4.34	4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	4.58	4.03	3.97	3.00
Frequency Distribution														

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Spring 2009

Page 588 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

				Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1. Did	you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1576	4.90	4.42	4.30	4.46	4.80
2. Did	the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	996/1576	4.60	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.20
4. Did	other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	197/1520	4.90	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.80
5. Did	assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	3.20	1347/1465	4.10	4.29	4.12	4.22	3.20
6. Did	written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	151/1434	4.90	4.37	4.14	4.30	4.80
7. Was	the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	900/1547	3.60	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.20
8. How	many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How	would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	263/1554	4.67	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.67
Lecture															
1. Wer	e the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.80
2. Did	the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was	lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	271/1486	4.80	4.43	4.32	4.41	4.80
4. Did	the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	309/1489	4.80	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.80
5. Did	audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	533/1277	4.25	4.10	4.03	4.04	4.25
	Discussion														
1. Did	class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	603/1279	4.67	4.53	4.17	4.31	4.33
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00
	e special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	322/ 878	3.67	4.36	4.05	4.33	4.33

Seminar

Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities

Self Paced

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

5. Were criteria for grading made clear

Course-Section: EDUC 419 0201

5

ASSESS READING

SMALL, SUE ELLE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires: 5

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

4 0 0

Frequency Distribution

4 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 375 **** 4.22 4.01 3.90 ****

3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/382 5.00 5.00 4.08 3.88 5.00

0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 326 3.00 4.58 4.03 3.97 ****

TEACH MATH IN ELEM SCH

Title Instructor: ALBRIGHT, DEBOR (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4 Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 589 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Questions	NR	NA	Fr 1	equei 2	ncies 3	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  2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals  3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0 0 0	0 0 3	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	4 4 1	5.00 5.00 5.00	1/1576 1/1576 1/1342	5.00 5.00 5.00	4.42 4.37 4.68	4.30 4.27 4.32	4.46 4.35 4.46	5.00 5.00 5.00
<ol> <li>Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals</li> <li>Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Did written assignments contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> <li>How many times was class cancelled</li> </ol>	0 0 0 1 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 1 0 0	4 3 4 3 3	5.00 4.75 5.00 5.00 4.75	1/1520 206/1465 1/1434 1/1547 758/1574	5.00 4.75 5.00 5.00 4.75	4.46 4.29 4.37 4.24 4.80	4.25 4.12 4.14 4.19 4.64	4.38 4.22 4.30 4.24 4.69	5.00 4.75 5.00 5.00 4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  Lecture	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	263/1554	2.83	4.08	4.10	4.24	2.83
<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> <li>Did the instructor seem interested in the subject</li> <li>Was lecture material presented and explained clearly</li> <li>Did the lectures contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding</li> </ol>	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 1	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	4 4 4 3	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 4.25	1/1488 1/1493 1/1486 1/1489 533/1277	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 4.25	4.58 4.80 4.43 4.39 4.10	4.47 4.73 4.32 4.32 4.03	4.55 4.80 4.41 4.38 4.04	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 4.25
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	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	4 4 4	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	1/1279 1/1270 1/1269 1/ 878	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	4.53 4.69 4.73 4.36	4.17 4.35 4.35 4.05	4.31 4.53 4.55 4.33	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	225/ 234	3.00	3.08	4.23	4.28	3.00
Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  3. Was the instructor available for consultation  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3 3 3 3	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	1 1 1 1	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	1/ 52 1/ 48 1/ 44 1/ 45 1/ 326	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	4.79 4.41 4.65 4.39 4.58	4.48 4.40 4.73 4.57 4.03	4.70 4.30 4.60 4.34 3.97	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	. – – –			Туј	pe 			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0			quir nera		or Ma	jors		0	Graduate Under-g		0 4	Majo Non-	or -major	0
84-150		Electives 0 #### - Means there are responses to be signif Other 4						_	h					

Course-Section: EDUC 420 0101 University of Maryland JUL 2, 2009 Title TEACH MATH IN ELEM SCH Baltimore County

Instructor: (Instr. D)

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 4

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Page 590

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Frequencies Instructor Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1576 5.00 4.42 4.30 4.46 5.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1576 5.00 4.37 4.27 4.35 5.00 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 3 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1342 5.00 4.68 4.32 4.46 5.00 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1520 5.00 4.46 4.25 4.38 5.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 206/1465 4.75 4.29 4.12 4.22 4.75 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  $0 \quad 0$ 0 0 4 5.00 1/1434 5.00 4.37 4.14 4.30 5.00 0 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1547 5.00 4.24 4.19 4.24 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 758/1574 4.75 4.80 4.64 4.69 4.75 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1279 5.00 4.53 4.17 4.31 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 Ω 0 0 4 5.00 1/1270 5.00 4.69 4.35 4.53 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.73 4.35 4.55 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 4 5.00 1/878 5.00 4.36 4.05 4.33 5.00 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 3 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 225/234 3.00 3.08 4.23 4.28 3.00 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 52 5.00 4.79 4.48 4.70 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 0 0 1 5.00 3 0 0 0 1/ 48 5.00 4.41 4.40 4.30 5.00 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 44 5.00 4.65 4.73 4.60 5.00 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 45 5.00 4.39 4.57 4.34 5.00 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 326 5.00 4.58 4.03 3.97 5.00

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

Course-Section: EDUC 421 0101 Title

TCHNG SCIENCE: ELEM SC

Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 11 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 591 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions			Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Quescions	NR	NA								Mean			Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	152/1576	4.91	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.46	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	138/1520	4.91	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	122/1465	4.91	4.29	4.12	4.22	4.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	146/1434	4.82	4.37	4.14	4.30	4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	179/1547	4.82	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	645/1574	4.82	4.80	4.64	4.69	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	222/1554	4.71	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1488	****	4.58	4.47	4.55	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1493	****	4.80	4.73	4.80	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1486	****	4.43	4.32	4.41	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1489	****	4.39	4.32	4.38	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	4.10	4.03	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	169/1279	4.91	4.53	4.17	4.31	4.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	345/1270	4.82	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	375/1269	4.82	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	175/ 878		4.36	4.05	4.33	4.64
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	Λ	Λ	3 00	****/ 52	****	4.79	4.48	4.70	****
2. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria		0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	4.41	4.40	4.30	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10 10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	4.65	4.73	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	4.39	4.57	4.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 326		4.58	4.03	3.97	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-			
				2	0						

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

Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 592

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: FITZHUGH, WILLI Enrollment: 11

Questionnaires: 8 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Quantian	<b>a</b>		MD	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies	3	_		ructor Rank	Course	_		Level	
		Question	s 		NK	NA				4	5 	Mean	Rank	mean	Mean	Mean	mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.42	4.30	4.46	4.50
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	448/1576	4.63	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.63
		uestions reflec			0	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.68	4.32	4.46	4.50
	_	uations reflect		1 3	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.75
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	206/1465	4.75	4.29	4.12	4.22	4.75
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	305/1434	4.63	4.37	4.14	4.30	4.63
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.50
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1227/1574	4.38	4.80	4.64	4.69	4.38
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	532/1554	4.40	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.40
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	324/1488	4.86	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.86
	the instructor seem interested in the subject lecture material presented and explained clear:				1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	393/1486	4.71	4.43	4.32	4.41	4.71
		es contribute t			1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	434/1489	4.71	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.71
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	309/1277	4.50	4.10	4.03	4.04	4.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	335/1279	4.67	4.53	4.17	4.31	4.67
				d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.67
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.67
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	-	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	164/ 878	4.67	4.36	4.05	4.33	4.67
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	ation	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	5
					ades Reasons 									- 				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	5	0	Graduat	е	3	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0				_										
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	l				0	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0											_			
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives							0	#### - 1				_	уh
				P 0							respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt			
				I 0		Ot1	her					8						
				? 0														

Course-Section: EDUC 439 0101 Title

OBSERVATION & ASSESSME

Instructor: SMALL, SUE ELLE

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 10

# Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 593 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1089/1576	4.10	4.42	4.30	4.46	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	4	1		1438/1576	3.40	4.37	4.27	4.35	3.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	0		****/1342	****	4.68	4.32	4.46	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	805/1520	4.30	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	798/1465	4.10	4.29	4.12	4.22	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.37	4.14	4.30	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	1	3	3.50	1347/1547	3.50	4.24	4.19	4.24	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	665/1574	4.80	4.80	4.64	4.69	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1081/1554	3.88	4.08	4.10	4.24	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	1111/1488	4.25	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	632/1493	4.88	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	5	1	3.63	1300/1486	3.63	4.43	4.32	4.41	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1050/1489	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	889/1277	3.75	4.10	4.03	4.04	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.53	4.17	4.31	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	326/1270	4.83	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	400/ 878	4.20	4.36	4.05	4.33	4.20
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.79	4.48	4.70	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	43/ 48	3.00	4.41	4.40	4.30	3.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	****	4.65	4.73	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	33/ 45	4.33	4.39	4.57	4.34	4.33
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	170/ 326	3.67	4.58	4.03	3.97	3.67
_		<u> </u>	1 1											

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

Course-Section: EDUC 441 0101 Univ

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: SCULLY, PAT

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 18

Grad.

8

3.50-4.00

6

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 594 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 -															
1. Did you	ı gain n	ew insights,skil	ls fro	m this course	0	0	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	485/1576	4.61	4.42	4.30	4.46	4.61
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	392/1576	4.67	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.67
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1342	****	4.68	4.32	4.46	****
4. Did oth	ner eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	179/1520	4.83	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.83
5. Did ass	signed r	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	529/1465	4.39	4.29	4.12	4.22	4.39
6. Did wri	itten as	signments contri	bute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	360/1434	4.56	4.37	4.14	4.30	4.56
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearly	expla	ined	0	0	0	1	0	3	14	4.67	339/1547	4.67	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.67
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	281/1574	4.94	4.80	4.64	4.69	4.94
9. How wou	ıld you	grade the overal	l teac	hing effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	281/1554	4.64	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.64
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	e the instructor's lectures well prepared the instructor seem interested in the subject		prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	547/1488	4.73	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.73	
	id the instructor seem interested in the subject as lecture material presented and explained clear:		3	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00		
		3	3	0	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	561/1486	4.60	4.43	4.32	4.41	4.60		
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned		1	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	309/1489	4.80	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.80	
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	3	10	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	856/1277	3.80	4.10	4.03	4.04	3.80
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contribu	ite to	what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	358/1279	4.64	4.53	4.17	4.31	4.64
2. Were al	ll stude	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage f	air an	d open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	278/1269	4.91	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.91
4. Were sp	pecial t	echniques succes	ssful	-	7	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	207/ 878	4.55	4.36	4.05	4.33	4.55
		Field W	Jork															
5. Did cor	nference	s help you carry	out f	ield activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.58	4.03	3.97	****
	Fi			Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	\$
														- 				
00-27 28-55	0 1	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	1 0	A 15 B 2		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ijor	S	0	Graduat	e	8	Majo	or	0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														

Electives

Other

0

17

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

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

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Enrollment: 6

COSTELLO, MARGA

Questionnaires: 5

Instructor:

Page 595 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

Questions	NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1576	4.80	4.42	4.30	4.46	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	222/1576		4.37	4.27	4.35	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.68	4.32	4.46	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	708/1465	4.20	4.29	4.12	4.22	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	l 0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.37	4.14	4.30	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	186/1547	4.80	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1574		4.80	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	316/1554	4.60	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	995/1488		4.58	4.47	4.55	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	561/1486		4.43	4.32	4.41	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	309/1489		4.39	4.32	4.38	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	159/1277	4.75	4.10	4.03	4.04	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.53	4.17	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	***	4.36	4.05	4.33	***
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	***	4.22	4.01	3.90	***
Freq	quency	y Dis	strib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	<b>:</b>			Re	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 0		Re	equir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 2 C 0		Ce	enera	1				0	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	major	5
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0		O.C.	LIICIA	_				O	onder 9	Laa	5	11011	major	3
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0		F:1	lecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoua	h
P 0								-	respons				_	
I O		٥t	her					4					-	
? 0		30												

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

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: SCULLY, PAT

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 5

Page 596 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

			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	Λ	Λ	Λ	_	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1576		4.37	4.27	4.35	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/15/0	5.00	4.46	4.27	4.38	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	513/1465	4.40	4.40	4.25	4.22	4.40
-	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1434		4.29	4.12	4.22	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	-	Ŭ	•	•	•	•	-		, -					
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.24	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	Τ	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.08	4.10	4.24	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	Ο	0	0	0	0	Λ	5	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.58	4.47	4.55	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1495		4.43	4.73	4.41	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	309/1489		4.43	4.32	4.38	4.80
	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	3	4.20	585/1277	4.20	4.10	4.32		
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	U	U	U	2	U	3	4.20	585/12//	4.20	4.10	4.03	4.04	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	Ω	0	Λ	Λ	Λ	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.53	4.17	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270		4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 878	****	4.36	4.05	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	3	Τ.	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	/ 0/0		4.30	±.05	4.33	
Enoca		. Diat	- m i bı	.+ :	_									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	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	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Ī
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-			
				2	Λ						

SCNDRY INTRNSHP SEMINA

Title Instructor: OLIVA, LINDA M.

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 597 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	187/1576	4.88	4.42	4.30	4.46	4 00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.88	939/1576	4.88	4.42	4.30	4.46	4.88 4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.25	583/1342	4.25	4.68	4.32	4.35	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	2	T		1041/1520	4.00	4.46	4.25	4.40	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.00	647/1465	4.00	4.40	4.12	4.22	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	797/1434	4.14	4.29	4.14	4.30	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	2	1	3		1182/1547	3.86	4.24	4.14	4.24	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.24	4.19	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	1	3	1		1340/1554	3.43	4.08	4.10		3.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	Τ	U	U	2	1	3	1	3.43	1340/1334	3.43	4.00	4.10	4.24	3.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	995/1488	4.40	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1286/1493	4.40	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1003/1486	4.20	4.43	4.32	4.41	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	813/1489	4.40	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	692/1277	4.00	4.10	4.03	4.04	4.00
1									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.53	4.17	4.31	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	4.36	4.05	4.33	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	83/ 85	3.50	4.41	4.72	4.77	3.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	78/ 79	3.50	4.54	4.69	4.69	3.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	4.46	4.64	4.64	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	80/ 80	3.00	4.31	4.61	4.52	3.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	371/ 375	2.50	4.22	4.01	3.90	2.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	Λ	3	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.79	4.48	4.70	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5 5	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	40/ 48	3.67	4.79	4.40	4.70	3.67
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	39/ 44	4.00	4.41	4.73	4.60	4.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	24/ 45	4.67	4.39	4.73	4.34	4.67
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	157/ 326	4.00	4.58	4.03	3.97	4.00
J. Did conferences help you carry out fred activities	5	U	U	U	Τ.	1	1	4.00	13// 3/0	4.00	4.50	4.03	3.21	4.00
Frequ	.ency	Dist	trib	ıtioı	n									

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

Title USING TECH SCIENCE/MAT

Instructor: FLOWERS,

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 12

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 598 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	mier	cies			Tnst	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	I.evel	Sect
Ouestions	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	7	0	2	3	0	2.08	1574/1576	2.08	4.42	4.30	4.43	2.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	5	0	0	2.17	1575/1576	2.17	4.37	4.27	4.32	2.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1342	****	4.68	4.32	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	2	3	2	0	2.56	1509/1520	2.56	4.46	4.25	4.36	2.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	2	4	0	0	2.00	1460/1465	2.00	4.29	4.12	4.25	2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	2	3	1	0	2.10	1431/1434	2.10	4.37	4.14	4.35	2.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	4	1	4	1	1	2.45	1518/1547	2.45	4.24	4.19	4.24	2.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	469/1574	4.91	4.80	4.64	4.75	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	6	2	1	1	0	1.70	1551/1554	1.70	4.08	4.10	4.18	1.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	8	2	1	0	0	1 26	1488/1488	1.36	4.58	4.47	4.52	1.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	4	2	3		1470/1493	3.55	4.80	4.73	4.80	3.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	4	4	2	0		1471/1486	2.50		4.32	4.37	2.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	1	2	1			1485/1489	1.73	4.39	4.32		1.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	4	1	3	1			1248/1277	2.40	4.10	4.03	4.08	2.40
J. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding			ı		J		1	2.40	1240/12//	2.40	1.10	1.05	4.00	2.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	5	4	0	1	2.42	1260/1279	2.42	4.53	4.17	4.34	2.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	4	2	4	1	1	2.42	1252/1270	2.42	4.69	4.35	4.53	2.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	2	6	1	1	2.75	1239/1269	2.75	4.73	4.35	4.55	2.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	2	0	3	1	0	2.50	849/ 878	2.50	4.36	4.05	4.11	2.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	2	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	234/ 234	1.33	3.08	4.23	4.36	1.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	240/ 240	1.00	3.47	4.35	4.37	1.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	1	2	0	0	0	0		****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 379	****	5.00	4.20	4.37	***
Seminar				•	_	•	•					4 50	4 = 0	
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 85	****	4.41	4.72	4.79	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.77	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	0	0	0		****/ 72	****	4.46	4.64	4.70	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	0	0	0		****/ 80	****	4.31	4.61	4.70	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	245/ 375	3.25	4.22	4.01	4.10	3.25
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 52	****	4.79	4.48	4.40	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	4.41	4.40	4.76	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 44	****	4.65	4.73	4.88	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	4.39	4.57	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 326	****	4.58	4.03	4.10	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	40/ 40	2.00	4.25	4.60	4.50	2.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	2	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.80	∠.UU ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	35/ 35	1.33	4.08	4.63	4.33	1.33
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	4.33	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	2	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 382	****		4.78	4.13	****
J. Here energy proceeds for all the scudents	O	4	_	J	J	J	_	5.00	/ 302		5.00	1.00	1.10	

Title USING TECH SCIENCE/MAT

Instructor: FLOWERS,

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 598 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		rned Cum. GPA			d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors					
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	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	9	Non-major	12			
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0									
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough						
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant				
				I	0	Other	9	-						
				?	0									

Title HUMAN LEARNING/COGNITI

Instructor: FILBERT, TERESA

Enrollment: 12
Questionnaires: 9

RT, TERESA Spring 2009

Page 599 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

		Ouestion	g		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	.1															
1. Did	1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course				0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	179/1576	4.89	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.89
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	256/1576	4.78	4.37	4.27	4.32	4.78
	_	uestions reflec		1 3	0	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.68	4.32	4.38	4.67
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.46	4.25	4.36	5.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	264/1465	4.67	4.29	4.12	4.25	4.67
6. Did	d written as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	176/1434	4.78	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.78
		g system clearl		ined	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.24	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How	w many times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	720/1574	4.78	4.80	4.64	4.75	4.78
9. How	w would you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	504/1554	4.43	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.43
		Lectur	e															
1. Wer	re the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.58	4.47	4.52	5.00
2. Did	d the instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was	s lecture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	378/1489	4.75	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.75
5. Did	d audiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	309/1277	4.50	4.10	4.03	4.08	4.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	d class disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	179/1279	4.89	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.89
2. Wer	re all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did	d the instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Wer	re special to	echniques succe	ssful		0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	164/ 878	4.67	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.67
		Self	Paced															
5. Wer	re there eno	ugh proctors fo	r all t	he students	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.13	5.00
				Frequ	ıency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									
Credit	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	\$			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27		0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	5	0	Graduat	е	5	Majo	r	0
28-55		1.00-1.99	0	в 0		_						_	7					
56-83		2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	neral	L				1	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	9
84-15		3.00-3.49	1	D 0								-			,			,
Grad.	. 5	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - 1				_	_j n
				P 0								_	respons	es to b	e sign	uiicar	ıt	
				I 0		Other						7						

0

INSTRUCTIONAL SYS DEV

Title Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI

Enrollment:

3 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 600 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions		NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Instructor Mean Rank		Course Dept Mean Mean		UMBC Level Mean Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576		4.42	4.30	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.32	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342		4.68	4.32	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	Τ	0	0	0	0 1	1	1	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	-	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.29	4.12	4.25	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	•	•	_	0	2	4.33	594/1434		4.37	4.14	4.35	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00 5.00	1/1547 1/1574	5.00	4.24	4.19	4.24	5.00
<u>.</u>	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/15/4		4.80 4.08	4.64 4.10	4.75 4.18	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	U	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.08	4.10	4.18	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.58	4.47	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1486		4.43	4.32	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.10	4.03	4.08	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.53	4.17	4.34	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.36	4.05	4.11	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.41	4.72	4.79	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.54	4.69	4.77	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 72		4.46	4.64	4.70	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.31	4.61	4.70	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	U	U	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.22	4.01	4.10	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.79	4.48	4.40	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 48	5.00	4.41	4.40	4.76	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44		4.65	4.73	4.88	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	4.39	4.57	4.65	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.58	4.03	4.10	5.00
1. III IIIIII MOOD NOIP 100 00111 000 11010 0001110100	~	Ŭ	J	•	ŭ	•	_	5.00	1, 520	3.00	1.55	1.00		3.00

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

University of Maryland Page 601
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

10

responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: EDUC 603 8010

13

INSTR SYS DEV II

PETSKA, DEBORAH

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

	Questions			NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean			Sect Mean
		General															
1. Did yo	1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course					0	0	0	1	10	4.91	163/1576	4.91	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.91
2. Did th	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals					0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.32	5.00
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflect th	e expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	298/1342	4.75	4.68	4.32	4.38	4.75
4. Did ot	ther evalu	uations reflect the	expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	138/1520	4.91	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.91
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contribute	to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	546/1465	4.36	4.29	4.12	4.25	4.36
			e to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10		110/1434		4.37	4.14	4.35	4.91
		g system clearly ex		2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.24	4.19	4.24	5.00
	-	was class cancelle		1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1574		4.80	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overall t	eaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	316/1554	4.60	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.60
		Lecture															
1. Were t	the instru	actor's lectures we	ll prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	248/1488	4.91	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.91
		ctor seem intereste		1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1493		4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly				0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	379/1486		4.43	4.32	4.37	4.73
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	194/1489	4.91	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.91
5. Did au	udiovisual	l techniques enhanc	e your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	258/1277	4.60	4.10	4.03	4.08	4.60
		Discussion															
1 വിക്കു	1000 8100		to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	169/1279	4.91	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.91
			aged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	260/1279		4.69	4.17	4.53	4.91
			and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	278/1269		4.73	4.35	4.55	4.91
		echniques successfu	-	1	0	0	0	0	2	9		127/ 878			4.05		4.82
T. WEIE S	speciai ce	sciniiques successiu	L	1	U	U	U	U	2	,	1.02	12// 0/0	4.02	4.30	4.03	7,11	4.02
		Field Work															
1. Did fi	ield exper	rience contribute t	o what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.79	4.48	4.40	****
			Frequ	ıency	/ Dist	trib	ution	n									
Considir a		G GD.	Former and and Consider to				D					т.				26	
Credits E	⊾arneα 	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				кеа	asons	; 			Ty	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 10		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	8	Majo	or	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	в 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0														
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives							1 #### - Means there are not er					enoug	ſh

Other

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

Baltimore County Spring 2009

University of Maryland

Page 602

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 5 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: EDUC 608 0101

INSTRUCT READING

SHELTON, NANCY

Title

Instructor:

	Questions				NR	NA	Fre	-	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did 1701	u gain n	Genera ew insights,ski		m this source	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	787/1576	4.40	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.40
		ew insignis,ski ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.40	996/1576	4.40	4.42	4.27	4.43	4.40
		uestions reflec		1 5	0	4	0	0	0	1	0		****/1342	****	4.68	4.32	4.38	****
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	921/1520	4.20	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.20
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	708/1465	4.20	4.29	4.12	4.25	4.20
				o what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.00
		g system clearl		2	0	0	3	0	1	0	1		1534/1547	2.20	4.24	4.19	4.24	2.20
		was class canc		ined	0	0	0	0	0	3	2		1202/1574	4.40	4.80	4.64	4.75	4.40
	-			hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.50
9. HOW WO	uiu you g	grade the overa	II Leac	ning effectiveness	3	U	U	U	U	1		4.50	393/1334	4.50	4.00	4.10	4.10	4.50
		Lectur	Δ															
1 Ware th	he instr	actor's lecture		nrenared	Λ	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	750/1488	4.60	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.60
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	810/1493		4.80	4.73	4.80	4.80
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	2		1003/1486		4.43	4.32	4.37	4.20
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	813/1489	4.40	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.40
				our understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	856/1277	3.80	4.10	4.03	4.08	3.80
J. Dia au	aiovisua.	r ceciminques en	nance y	our understanding	U	U	U	U	2	2	_	3.00	030/12//	3.00	1.10	1.03	1.00	3.00
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al:	acc dica			what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	962/1279	3.75	4.53	4.17	4.34	3.75
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.50
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.50
		echniques succe		d Open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	2		221/ 878		4.73	4.05		4.50
4. Were s	peciai c	eciniiques succe	SSIUI		1	U	U	U	U	2	_	4.50	221/ 0/0	4.50	4.30	4.05	4.11	4.50
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	es Reasons Type									Majors	;			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	 0	A 4						iors		0	Graduat		2	Majo	~~~~~	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	A 4 B 0		кес	quire	eu I	טויו בע	TOLS		U	Graduat	E	4	Ma JC) <u>T</u>	U
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Cor	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non	major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		Gei	nela.	L				U	onder-g	Lau	3	MOII-	·iiia JOI	5
84-150 Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	D 0 F 0		. רים	0a+ i -	700				0	####	Moona +	horo	vo not	onomo	rh
Grau.	۷	3.30-4.00	4	P 0	Electives 0					U	#### - Means there are not enouresponses to be significant			_	111			
				I 0		O+1	her					5	respons	es co L	e sign	ıııcaı.	I L	
				2 1		ULI	ner					5						
				; ±														

Course-Section: EDUC 614 0101 University of Maryland Title ADOLESCENT LITERATURE Baltimore County Instructor:

Page 603 JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029 STOVER, LOIS (Instr. A)

Enrollment:	5
Onestionnaires:	4

	-
Ouestionnaires:	4

Student.	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
Doddon	004100	_, ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	2 accountant

									Inst	ructor	Course	Course Dept		UMBC Level				
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did vo	nı dain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.43	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	279/1576		4.37	4.27	4.32	4.75
		uestions reflec			1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342		4.68	4.32	4.38	5.00
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.75
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.29	4.12	4.25	5.00
	_	-		o what you learned		0	0	0	0	1	3		193/1434		4.37	4.14	4.35	4.75
		g system clearl		-	. 0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.24	4.19	4.24	5.00
		was class canc		inca	0	0	0	0	0	1	3		758/1574		4.80	4.64	4.75	4.75
	-			hing effectiveness	. 0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	395/1554		4.08	4.10	4.18	4.42
J. 110 II II 0	ouru you	grade 5116 5 7 6 1 d		ning directions		Ü	ŭ	Ü	Ü	_	_	1.50	3737 1331		1.00	1110	1110	
		Lectur			•				•	_	_			4 = 0	4 = 0		4 = 0	4 = 0
		uctor's lecture			0	0	0	1	0	1	2		1233/1488		4.58	4.47	4.52	4.50
	the instructor seem interested in the subject lecture material presented and explained clear				0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
					0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	678/1486		4.43	4.32	4.37	4.25
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did au	ıdiovisua.	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	309/1277	4.25	4.10	4.03	4.08	4.25
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.53	4.17	4.34	5.00
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful	_	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.50
				Frec	uency	z Dis	trib	utio	n									
				1109	aciic	DID	CIID	uc10.										
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades Rea								S			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Re	auir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	- – – – s	0	Graduat	 e	2	Majo	 or	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		_	=			J						5 -		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad	2	Non-	-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									5				3	
Grad.						El	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - Means there are not enough				1h	
				P 0									respons				_	•
				I 0		Ot:	her					2			3			
				? 0														

Course-Section: EDUC 614 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County ADOLESCENT LITERATURE

Page 604 JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Instructor: NORTH-COLEMAN, (Instr. B) Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	5	
Questionnaires:	4	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions				MD	NA	Fr	_	ncies 3	5	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
		Quescion	ь 												Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.43	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	279/1576	4.75	4.37	4.27	4.32	4.75
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.38	5.00
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.75
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.29	4.12	4.25	5.00
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	193/1434	4.75	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.75
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.24	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	758/1574	4.75	4.80	4.64	4.75	4.75
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	623/1554	4.42	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.42
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	4.50	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.50
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was le	Was lecture material presented and explained clearl					0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1101/1486	4.25	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.25
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	692/1277	4.25	4.10	4.03	4.08	4.25
		Discus																
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1279		4.53	4.17	4.34	5.00
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1270		4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00
				d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1269		4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.50
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27							auir	ad f	or Ma			0	Graduat		2	Majo		 1
28-55						1/6/	dutt.	Ju I	OT 1410	ء ـ ب	,		Graduat	_	_	1.101	<i>,</i> _	1
56-83						Ger	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad	2	Non-	-major	3
84-150						001	C- a	-				-	onaci g		_	1,011		5
Grad.					Electives 0 #### - Means th					here =	are not	enouc	rh					
JI aa.	4	3.30 1.00	2	P 0	Electives					#### - Means there are not enough			J					
				I O		O+1	her					2	r capons	CD CO L	c sign	ıııcaı	10	
				2 0		O C.	1101					4						

0

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 605

MATERIALS TEACH READ YOUNG, PATRICIA Spring 2009 Enrollment: 7

Questionnaires: 4

Course-Section: EDUC 615 0101 Title JUL 2, 2009 Instructor: Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	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	952/1576	4.25	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	3		939/1576		4.37	4.27	4.32	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1256/1520	3.75	4.46	4.25	4.36	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	206/1465	4.75	4.29	4.12	4.25	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	838/1547	4.25	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1448/1554	3.00	4.08	4.10	4.18	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4 75	505/1488	4.75	4 58	4.47	4 52	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	1	2		1411/1493	4.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	_		1101/1486		4.43	4.32	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	2		1313/1489			4.32		3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	1	0		1219/1277			4.03	4.08	2.67
_, ,														
Discussion	•	0	0	•	_	0	•	4 00	000/1000	4 00	4 50	4 1 1	4 24	4 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	2		802/1279	4.00			4.34	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1270		4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.73	4.35	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful		0	0	U	2	U	2	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.00
Frequ	iency	Dist	ribu	ıtioı	n									
Charlibe Francis Car CD Francisco Constant				ъ.					m-				No	

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

Course-Section: EDUC 622 0101

INSTRUC STRGY ELEM MAT

Title Instructor: ALBRIGHT, DEBOR

Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 606 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			Fre	equei 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.46	4.25	4.36	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.29	4.12	4.25	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434		4.37	4.14	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1547		4.24	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1		1079/1574		4.80	4.64	4.75	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.08	4.10	4.18	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.58	4.47	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.10	4.03	4.08	5.00
Discussion	0	0	•	_	0	0	0	F 00	1 /1000	F 00	4 50	4 10	4 2 4	F 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.53	4.17	4.34	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270 1/1269	5.00 5.00	4.69 4.73	4.35 4.35	4.53 4.55	5.00 5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	0 1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00		4.35	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successiul	1	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	1/ 8/8	5.00	4.30	4.05	4.11	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.79	4.48	4.40	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.41	4.40	4.76	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.65	4.73	4.88	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	4.39	4.57	4.65	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities			0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.58	4.03	4.10	5.00
Process		. D	d la -		_									

Credits E	arned	rned Cum. GPA			d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	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	0	Non-major	2	
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	nificant		
				I	0	Other	2	-	-	•		
				2	0							

Course-Section: EDUC 625 0101 University of Maryland Title TEACH READ WRIT ESL I

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 607

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 13 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Questionnaires: 13

Instructor:

SHIN, SARAH

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Instructor		Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	289/1576	4.77	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	121/1576		4.37	4.27	4.32	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3		4.73	333/1342		4.68	4.32	4.38	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	311/1520		4.46	4.25	4.36	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	347/1465	4.54	4.29	4.12	4.25	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	134/1434	4.85	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	237/1554	4.70	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	198/1488	4.92	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	154/1486	4.92	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	742/1489	4.46	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	489/1277	4.31	4.10	4.03	4.08	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	373/1279	4.62	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	317/1270		4.69	4.35	4.53	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	342/1269		4.73	4.35	4.55	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	322/ 878		4.36	4.05	4.11	
Here special committees successful	Ü	_	_	3	_	_	Ü	1.55	322, 070	1.33	1.50	1.05		1.55
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	6	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 644 0101 Title LING/ESOL EDUCATORS SHIN, SARAH

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 11

13

Baltimore County Spring 2009

University of Maryland Page 608 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluati	ion Quest:	ionna:	ire
---------	--------	----------	------------	--------	-----

Questions				NR	NA	Fre 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		General	 															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,skil	=	this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	335/1576	4.73	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.73
2. Did the	e instruc	tor make clear	the expe	cted goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	313/1576	4.73	4.37	4.27	4.32	4.73
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	541/1342	4.55	4.68	4.32	4.38	4.55
		ations reflect			0	3	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.50
		adings contribu			0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	225/1465	4.73	4.29	4.12	4.25	4.73
				what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	8		151/1434		4.37	4.14	4.35	4.80
		system clearly		ied	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	123/1547	4.90	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.90
	-	was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	5	6		1048/1574		4.80	4.64	4.75	4.55
9. How wou	ıld you g	rade the overal	ll teachi	ng effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	623/1554	4.33	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.33
		Lecture	9															
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lectures	s well pr	epared	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	248/1488	4.91	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.91
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem intere	ested in	the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presented	d and exp	lained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	379/1486	4.73	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.73
		s contribute to			0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	539/1489	4.64	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.64
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enh	nance you	r understanding	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	356/1277	4.45	4.10	4.03	4.08	4.45
	Discussion																	
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contribu	ate to wh	at you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	244/1279	4.78	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.78
2. Were al	ll studen	ts actively end	couraged	to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	279/1270	4.89	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.89
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage f	air and	open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful		2	4	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	603/ 878	3.80	4.36	4.05	4.11	3.80
		Seminar	-															
5. Were cr	riteria f	or grading made	e clear		10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.22	4.01	4.10	***
		Field V	Jork															
5. Did con	nferences	help you carry	out fie	eld activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.58	4.03	4.10	5.00
				Frequ	iency	Dis	tribu	ıtioı	ı									
				1														
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	s	0	Graduat	e	5	Majo	r	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 4														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	major	0
84-150																		
Grad.						Electives						0	#### - I				_	h
	P 0					responses					es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt				
	I 0					Ot1	ner				1	1						
	? 1																	

Course-Section: EDUC 648 8010 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 10

CONSULTING

11

BUELOW, JOHN

Spring 2009

Page 609

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	${\tt Evaluation}$	Questionnaire
---------	--------	--------------------	---------------

Questions					NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 544		General w insights,skil		+h:	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.80	042/1576	4 00	4 40	4 20	1 12	4 00
		w insights,skii tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	8 7	4.80	243/1576 350/1576		4.42 4.37	4.30	4.43	4.80 4.70
		estions reflect	_		0	6	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342		4.68	4.32	4.32	5.00
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	197/1520		4.46	4.25	4.36	4.80
		adings contribu			0	0	0	0	0	1	9		122/1465		4.29	4.12	4.25	4.90
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	151/1434		4.37	4.14	4.35	4.80
		system clearly			0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	303/1547		4.24	4.19	4.24	4.70
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	469/1574	4.90	4.80	4.64	4.75	4.90
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overal	ll teachi	ng effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.08	4.10	4.18	5.00
		Lecture	9															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures	s well pr	epared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.80
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem intere	ested in	the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
		erial presented			0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	271/1486	4.80	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.80
		s contribute to			0	0 5	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1489		4.39	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did aud	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						1	0	1	1	2	3.60	974/1277	3.60	4.10	4.03	4.08	3.60
	Discussion																	
		ssions contribu		-	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	169/1279	4.90	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.90
		ts actively end			0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1270		4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00
		_		open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1269		4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful		0	2	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	179/ 878	4.63	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.63
		Field W																
		ience contribut			9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52		4.79	4.48	4.40	****
_	_	understand you			9	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.00	****/ 48		4.41	4.40	4.76	****
		tor available f			9	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 44		4.65	4.73	4.88	****
		could you discu			9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45		4.39	4.57	4.65	****
5. Did cor	nferences	help you carry	y out fie	eld activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.58	4.03	4.10	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	\$			Ту	pe			Majors	1
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7						Per	 mir		or Ma	ior		0	 Graduat		9	Majo		10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 2		1.00	2411	-u 10	J_ 110	. , 🔾 .	~	•	Gradac	~	-	1100	-	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	L				9	Under-q	rad	1	Non-	major	0
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0						001		_				-	0.1.0.01		_	2.011		Ŭ
Grad. 9 3.50-4.00 9 F 0					Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enou	h	
	P 0												respons				_	
I 0					Otl	ner					2	-						
? 1																		

Course-Section: EDUC 650 0101

EDUC IN CULTURAL PERSP

Title Instructor: SMITH JR, MURDU

Enrollment:

23 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 610 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	429/1576	4.65	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	364/1576	4.68	4.37	4.27	4.32	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	240/1342	4.80	4.68	4.32	4.38	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	395/1520	4.60	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	187/1465	4.79	4.29	4.12	4.25	4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	243/1434	4.70	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	2	0	15	4.61	399/1547	4.61	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1574		4.80	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	3		4.65	281/1554		4.08	4.10		4.65
. 3														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	442/1488	4.79	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	557/1493	4.90	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	422/1486	4.70	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	309/1489	4.80	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	201/1277	4.68	4.10	4.03	4.08	4.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	16	4.74	279/1279	4.74	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.74
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	269/1270	4.89	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	1	17	4.79	409/1269	4.79	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	214/ 878	4.53	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.53
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	3.08	4.23	4.36	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.47	4.35	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	5.00	4.20	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.41	4.72	4.79	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.77	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	***	4.46	4.64	4.70	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.31	4.61	4.70	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.22	4.01	4.10	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.79	4.48	4.40	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.41	4.40	4.76	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.65	4.73	4.88	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.39	4.57	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.58	4.03	4.10	****
0.16 D. 1														
Self Paced	1.0	^	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 40	***	4 25	1 60	4 50	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, 10	****	4.25	4.60	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24		5.00	4.83	4.80	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	4.75	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.13	5.00

Course-Section: EDUC 650 0101

Title EDUC IN CULTURAL PERSP

Instructor:

SMITH JR, MURDU

Enrollment: 23

Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 610 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	14	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	14	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	-		_	
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 655 0101 University of Maryl Title TCH READ WRIT ESL II Baltimore County Instructor: LINVILLE, HEATH Spring 2009

Enrollment:

11

University of Maryland Page 611
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 9 Student Course Evaluation Question	onnaire
--	---------

Questions				MB	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	s 4	5		ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls from	n this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	861/1576	4.33	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.33
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	851/1576	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.32	4.33
3. Did th	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the ex	spected goals	0	4	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	709/1342	4.40	4.68	4.32	4.38	4.40
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	768/1520	4.33	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.33
				what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	616/1465	4.29	4.29	4.12	4.25	4.29
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	816/1434	4.13	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.13
		g system clearl		ned	2	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.00
8. How max	ny times	was class canc	elled		2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1177/1574	4.43	4.80	4.64	4.75	4.43
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	682/1554	4.29	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.29
		Lectur	e															
		actor's lecture			0	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.00
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested ir	n the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	1167/1493	4.56	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.56
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and ex	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	891/1486	4.33	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.33
	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned							1	1	2	5	4.22	976/1489	4.22	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.22
5. Did au	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						0	0	2	3	3	4.13	638/1277	4.13	4.10	4.03	4.08	4.13
		Discus																
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	335/1279	4.67	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.67
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	279/1270	4.89	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.89
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair and	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.67
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	204/ 878	4.56	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.56
		Self	Paced															
5. Were t	here enou	ugh proctors fo	r all th	ne students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.13	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad								asons	\$			Ty	pe			Majors	}
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	5	0	Graduat	е	5	Majo	or	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 1		~		,				-	1	,				0
56-83						Ger	nera	Τ				1	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	2
	84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0											0			,			,
Grad. 5 3.50-4.00 2 F 0					Electives							0	#### - 1					ın
	P 0											_	respons	es to b	e sign	ıiican	ıt	
	I 1					Oth	ner					7						
	? 0																	

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Course-Section: EDUC 656 0101

14

TCH READ WRIT ECE

SCULLY, PATRICI

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 9

Page 612 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

_			
Ctudent	Course	Twaluation	Ouestionnaire
bludent	COULSE	Evaluation	Oucocidinatic

								equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	179/1576	4.89	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.89
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	166/1576	4.89	4.37	4.27	4.32	4.89
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.38	5.00
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.46	4.25	4.36	5.00
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.29	4.12	4.25	5.00
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	176/1434	4.78	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.78
7. Was th	ne gradino	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	217/1547	4.78	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.78
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.08	4.10	4.18	5.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.58	4.47	4.52	5.00
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.37	5.00
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	217/1489	4.89	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.89
				our understanding	0	1	1	0	1	5	1	3.63	963/1277		4.10	4.03		3.63
		Discus	gion															
1 Did cl	agg digg			what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	296/1279	4.71	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.71
				ed to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	307/1270	4.86	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.86
				d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	491/1269	4.71	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.71
		echniques succe		a open albeablion	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	197/ 878		4.36	4.05		4.57
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ıtioı	า									
				11040	iciic j	DID	CIID	20101										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6						quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	 3	0	Graduat	 е	6	Majo	r •	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0 #### - M				Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh					
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
												_						

Other

I

?

0

0

Course-Section: EDUC 658 0101

READING CONTENT AREA I

Title Instructor: NORTH-COLEMAN,

Enrollment: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Questionnaires: 10

Page 613 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	S		Inst	ructor	Course	_			Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	500/1576	3.97	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	476/1576	3.80	4.37	4.27	4.32	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	480/1342	4.60	4.68	4.32	4.38	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	395/1520	4.00	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	304/1465	4.40	4.29	4.12	4.25	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	243/1434	3.75	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	0	7	4.30	784/1547	3.32	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	866/1574	4.68	4.80	4.64	4.75	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	355/1554	3.48	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	278/1488	4.28	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1493	4.25	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1486	4.00	4.43	4.32	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	637/1489	3.44	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	366/1277	3.81		4.03	4.08	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	312/1279	4.35	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	355/1270	4.40	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	278/1269	4.45	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	135/ 878	4.29	4.36	4.05	4.11	
i. Mere preside deciminates successival	Ü	_	ŭ	ŭ	-	Ü	Ü	11.70	133, 373	1.27	1.50	1.05		1
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	32/ 52	4.83	4.79	4.48	4.40	4.83
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria		0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	38/ 48	3.83	4.41	4.40	4.76	3.83
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	31/ 44	4.80	4.65	4.73	4.88	4.80
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	44/ 45	3.67	4.39	4.57	4.65	3.67
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	142/ 326	4.67	4.58	4.03	4.10	4.67

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1		10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	 5	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 658 0201

READING CONTENT AREA I

Title Instructor: WILLIAMS, NICOL

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 614 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	_	ncie	5			tructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1494/1576	3.97	4.42	4.30	4.43	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	3.00	1523/1576	3.80	4.37	4.27	4.32	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1342	4.60	4.68	4.32	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1400/1520	4.00	4.46	4.25	4.36	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	708/1465	4.40	4.29	4.12	4.25	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1402/1434	3.75	4.37	4.14	4.35	2.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	1	1	0	2.33	1527/1547	3.32	4.24	4.19	4.24	2.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	911/1574	4.68	4.80	4.64	4.75	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	3	2	0	0	2.40	1533/1554	3.48	4.08	4.10	4.18	2.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1368/1488	4.28	4.58	4.47	4.52	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	1473/1493	4.25	4.80	4.73	4.80	3.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	3.00	1421/1486	4.00	4.43	4.32	4.37	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	2.33	1475/1489	3.44	4.39	4.32	4.38	2.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1128/1277	3.81	4.10	4.03	4.08	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	802/1279	4.35	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	928/1270	4.40	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	928/1269	4.45	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	603/ 878	4.29	4.36	4.05	4.11	3.80
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	4.83	4.79	4.48	4.40	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	3.83	4.41	4.40	4.76	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	S			Туј	pe			Majors	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	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	3	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	3	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	5	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 665 0101 University of Maryland Title CREATIVE MEDIA-ECE

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: COSTELLO, MARGA

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 3

JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 615

- ·				
Ctudont	('Ollivea	Evaluation	Ollection	naira

			Fre	eauer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.32	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00		4.32	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00		4.25	4.36	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.29	4.12	4.25	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.37		4.35	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1547	5.00	4.24	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	263/1554	4.67	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.58	4.47	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1486	5.00		4.32	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.10	4.03	4.08	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.53	4.17	4.34	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 234	5.00	3.08	4.23	4.36	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	3.47	4.35	4.37	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 229	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.51	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 232	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.47	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 379	5.00	5.00	4.20	4.37	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.41	4.72	4.79	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.54	4.69	4.77	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 72	5.00		4.64	4.70	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 80	5.00		4.61	4.70	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.22	4.01	4.10	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.79	4.48	4.40	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.41	4.40	4.76	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.65	4.73	4.88	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 45	5.00	4.39	4.57	4.65	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.58		4.10	5.00
	-	ŭ	-	-	,	-	-		_, 510					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 40	5.00	4.25	4.60	4.50	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.83	4.80	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.08	4.67	4.33	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.78	4.75	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.13	5.00

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

COSTELLO, MARGA

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 615 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: EDUC 667 0101 University of Maryland Title GRAMMAR FOR AMER ENGL Instructor: NELSON, JOHN E.

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 616

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:

DILL OTTIMOTO.	10
Onestionnaires:	17

Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 6 4.82 208/1576 4.82 4.37 4.27 4.32 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 1 1 14 4.81 233/1342 4.81 4.68 4.32 4.38 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 0 0 1 15 4.71 302/1520 4.71 4.46 4.25 4.36 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 6 1 0 0 2 6 4.33 571/1465 4.33 4.29 4.12 4.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 0 3 11 4.60 323/1343 4.60 4.37 4.14 4.35 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4 4.87 148/1547 4.87 4.24 4.19 4.24 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 1/1574 5.00 4.80 4.64 4.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 12 4.73 208/1554 4.73 4.08 4.10 4.18 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 12 4.73 208/1554 4.73 4.08 4.10 4.18 Lecture 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 16 4.88 607/1493 4.88 4.80 4.73 4.80 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 11 4.59 584/1486 4.59 4.43 4.32 4.37 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 0 0 1 1 4 4.77 731/1489 4.77 4.39 4.32 4.38 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 0 0 2 2 9 4.07 783/1279 4.07 4.53 4.17 4.34 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 0 0 1 1 2 3 4.33 463/1277 4.33 4.10 4.03 4.08 Discussion 2. Discussion 2 0 1 1 1 0 0 1 2 3 4.67 535/1269 4.67 4.73 4.35 4.55 4.56 Frequency Distribution 4.00 4.69 4.55 4.55 4.55 4.56 4.67 4.73 4.35 4.55 4.56 4.67 4.73 4.35 4.55 4.56 6.50 1.00-1.99 0 8 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Questions					NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 3 3 13 4.71 359/1576 4.71 4.42 4.30 4.43 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 0 0 16 4.82 208/1576 4.82 4.37 4.27 4.32 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 1 1 14 4.81 233/1342 4.81 4.68 4.32 4.38 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 0 0 1 15 4.71 302/1520 4.71 4.46 4.25 4.36 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 6 1 0 0 2 6 4.33 571/1465 4.33 4.29 4.12 4.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 1 0 3 11 4.60 323/1434 4.60 4.37 4.14 4.35 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 4 4.87 148/1547 4.87 4.24 4.19 4.24 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 1 0 14 4.87 148/1547 4.87 4.24 4.19 4.25 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 12 4.73 208/1554 4.73 4.08 4.10 4.18 Lecture Lecture Lecture Lecture Lecture Lecture Lecture Louis a contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 14 4.71 610/1488 4.71 4.58 4.47 4.52 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 1743 4.88 4.80 4.73 4.80 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.11 4.59 584/1486 4.59 4.43 4.32 4.38 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 11 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 463/1277 4.33 4.10 4.03 4.08 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 11 0 0 1 2 3 4.07 736/1270 4.07 4.53 4.17 4.34 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 1 0 2 1 11 4.40 736/1270 4.04 4.69 4.35 4.53 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 1 1 0 13 4.67 535/1269 4.67 4.73 4.35 4.55 4.56 4.56 4.56 4.56 4.56 4.56 4.5			 Cenera	1															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 16 4.82 208/1576 4.82 4.37 4.27 4.32 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 1 1 14 4.81 233/1342 4.81 4.68 4.32 4.38 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 0 0 1 15 4.71 302/1520 4.71 4.66 4.25 4.36 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 6 1 0 0 2 6 4.33 571/1465 4.33 4.29 4.12 4.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 0 3 11 4.60 323/143 4.60 4.37 4.14 4.35 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 0 0 1 0 14 4.87 148/1547 4.87 4.24 4.19 4.24 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 1 0 15 5.00 1/1574 5.00 4.80 4.64 4.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 12 24 4.73 208/1554 4.73 4.08 4.10 4.18 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 16 4.88 607/1493 4.88 4.80 4.73 4.80 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 0 16 4.88 607/1493 4.88 4.80 4.73 4.80 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 11 4.59 584/1486 4.59 4.43 4.32 4.37 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 2 0 0 1 1 4 4.77 731/1489 4.47 4.39 4.32 4.38 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 11 0 0 1 2 3 4.07 733/1479 4.37 4.03 4.08 4.00 4.03 4.08 4.00 4.03 4.08 4.00 4.03 4.08 4.00 4.03 4.08 4.00 4.03 4.08 4.00 4.03 4.08 4.00 4.03 4.08 4.00 4.03 4.08 4.00 4.03 4.03 4.08 4.00 4.03 4.03 4.08 4.00 4.03 4.03 4.08 4.00 4.03 4.03 4.08 4.00 4.03 4.03 4.03 4.03 4.03 4.03 4.03	. Did voi	u gain ne		_	this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	359/1576	4.71	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 1 1 1 4 4.81 233/1342 4.81 4.68 4.32 4.38 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 0 0 1 15 4.71 302/1520 4.71 4.46 4.25 4.38 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 0 0 1 15 4.71 302/1520 4.71 4.46 4.25 4.36 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 6 1 0 0 2 6 4.33 571/1465 4.33 4.29 4.12 4.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 0 3 11 4.60 323/1434 4.60 4.37 4.14 4.35 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 0 1 0 14 4.87 148/1547 4.87 4.24 4.19 4.24 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 1/1574 5.00 4.80 4.64 4.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 12 4.73 208/1554 4.73 4.08 4.10 4.18						-	-	•	•	0	_								4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 15 4.71 302/1520 4.71 4.66 4.25 4.36 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 6 1 0 0 2 6 4.33 571/1465 4.33 4.29 4.12 4.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 0 3 11 4.60 323/1434 4.60 4.37 4.14 4.35 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 14 4.87 148/1547 4.87 4.24 4.19 4.24 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 14 4.87 148/1547 4.87 4.24 4.19 4.24 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 12 12 4.73 208/1554 4.73 4.08 4.10 4.18 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 12 2 4.73 208/1554 4.73 4.08 4.10 4.18 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 1 0 16 4.88 607/1493 4.88 4.71 4.58 4.47 4.52 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 0 16 4.88 607/1493 4.88 4.80 4.73 4.80 9. How would you grade the overall explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 0 16 4.88 607/1493 4.88 4.80 4.73 4.80 9. How would you grade the overall explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 0 16 4.88 607/1493 4.88 4.80 4.73 4.80 9. How would you grade the overall explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 1 14 4.79 53/1486 4.59 4.43 4.32 4.37 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01								-	_	1	-								4.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 6 1 0 0 2 6 4.33 571/1465 4.33 4.29 4.12 4.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 0 3 11 4.60 323/1434 4.60 4.37 4.14 4.35 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 0 1 0 1 4 4.87 148/1547 4.87 4.24 4.19 4.24 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 1 0 1 5 5.00 1/1574 5.00 4.80 4.64 4.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 12 4.73 208/1554 4.73 4.08 4.10 4.18 Lecture Lecture Lecture Lecture Lecture Lecture Nere the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 14 4.71 610/1488 4.71 4.58 4.47 4.52 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 16 4.88 607/1493 4.88 4.80 4.73 4.80 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 11 4.59 584/1486 4.59 4.43 4.32 4.37 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 1 2 3 4.47 731/1489 4.47 4.39 4.32 4.38 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 11 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 4.33 4.37 4.33 4.10 4.03 4.08 Discussion Discussion Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 0 2 2 9 4.07 783/1279 4.07 4.33 4.10 4.03 4.08 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09		_							0	0				, -					4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 0 3 11 4.60 323/1434 4.60 4.37 4.14 4.35 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 0 1 0 14 4.87 148/1547 4.87 4.24 4.19 4.24 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 1/1574 5.00 4.80 4.64 4.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 12 4.73 208/1554 4.73 4.08 4.10 4.18 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 14 4.71 610/1488 4.71 4.58 4.47 4.52 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 16 4.88 607/1493 4.88 4.80 4.73 4.80 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 10 4.85 607/1493 4.88 4.80 4.73 4.80 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 11 4.59 584/1486 4.59 4.43 4.32 4.37 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 0 0 1 14 4.47 731/1489 4.47 4.39 4.32 4.38 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 11 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 463/1277 4.33 4.10 4.03 4.08 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 0 2 2 9 4.07 783/1279 4.07 4.53 4.17 4.34 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 1 0 2 1 11 4.40 736/1270 4.40 4.69 4.35 4.53 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 1 1 0 2 1 11 4.40 736/1270 4.40 4.69 4.35 4.55 4. Were special techniques successful 2 3 2 0 1 2 7 4.00 464/878 4.00 4.36 4.05 4.11 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 7 Majors 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 1 Under-grad 10 Non-major				_	_		6	1	0	0	2	6		,					4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 0 1 0 14 4.87 148/1547 4.87 4.24 4.19 4.24 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 15 5.00 1/1574 5.00 4.80 4.64 4.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 12 4.73 208/1554 4.73 4.08 4.10 4.18 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 14 4.71 610/1488 4.71 4.58 4.47 4.52 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 16 4.88 607/1493 4.88 4.80 4.73 4.80 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 11 4.59 584/1486 4.59 4.43 4.32 4.37 4.08 4.10 4.18 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 0 0 1 14 4.47 731/1489 4.47 4.39 4.32 4.38 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 11 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 463/1277 4.33 4.10 4.03 4.08 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 0 2 0 2 9 4.07 783/1279 4.07 4.53 4.17 4.34 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 1 0 2 1 11 4.40 736/1270 4.40 4.69 4.35 4.53 4.53 4.54 4.55 4.55 4.55 4.55							0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60					4.35	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 0 15 5.00 1/1574 5.00 4.80 4.64 4.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 12 4.73 208/1554 4.73 4.08 4.10 4.18 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 14 4.71 610/1488 4.71 4.58 4.47 4.52 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 0 16 4.88 607/1493 4.88 4.80 4.73 4.80 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 5 11 4.59 554/1486 4.59 4.43 4.32 4.37 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 0 0 1 14 4.47 731/1489 4.47 4.39 4.32 4.38 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 11 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 463/1277 4.33 4.10 4.03 4.08 Discussion Discussion Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 0 2 0 2 3 4.33 463/1277 4.33 4.10 4.03 4.08 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00							0	0	0	1	0	14		,					
Discussion Dis							0	0	0	0	0			-, -					
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 2 1 14 4.71 610/1488 4.71 4.58 4.47 4.52 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 0 16 4.88 607/1493 4.88 4.80 4.73 4.80 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 5 11 4.59 584/1486 4.59 4.43 4.32 4.37 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 0 0 1 14 4.47 731/1489 4.47 4.39 4.32 4.38 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 11 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 463/1277 4.33 4.10 4.03 4.08 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 0 2 0 2 9 4.07 783/1279 4.07 4.53 4.17 4.34 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 1 0 2 1 11 4.40 736/1270 4.40 4.69 4.35 4.53 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 1 1 0 13 4.67 535/1269 4.67 4.73 4.35 4.55 4. Were special techniques successful Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 7 Major 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 1 Under-grad 10 Non-major		-			ing effectiveness		0	0	0	1	2	12		, -					
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 2 1 14 4.71 610/1488 4.71 4.58 4.47 4.52 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 0 16 4.88 607/1493 4.88 4.80 4.73 4.80 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 5 11 4.59 584/1486 4.59 4.43 4.32 4.37 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 0 0 1 14 4.47 731/1489 4.47 4.39 4.32 4.38 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 11 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 463/1277 4.33 4.10 4.03 4.08 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 0 2 0 2 9 4.07 783/1279 4.07 4.53 4.17 4.34 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 1 0 2 1 11 4.40 736/1270 4.40 4.69 4.35 4.53 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 1 1 0 13 4.67 535/1269 4.67 4.73 4.35 4.55 4. Were special techniques successful Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 7 Major 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 1 Under-grad 10 Non-major			T a ##	_															
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 0 16 4.88 607/1493 4.88 4.80 4.73 4.80 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 5 11 4.59 584/1486 4.59 4.43 4.32 4.37 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 0 0 1 14 4.47 731/1489 4.47 4.39 4.32 4.38 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 11 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 463/1277 4.33 4.10 4.03 4.08 Discussion Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 0 2 2 9 4.07 783/1279 4.07 4.53 4.17 4.34 4.09 4.09 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20	T-7 1-1	b		_		0	0	0	0	2	1	1 /	1 71	610/1400	1 71	4 50	1 17	4 50	4 71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 5 11 4.59 584/1486 4.59 4.43 4.32 4.37 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 0 0 1 14 4.47 731/1489 4.47 4.39 4.32 4.38 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 11 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 463/1277 4.33 4.10 4.03 4.08 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 0 2 2 9 4.07 783/1279 4.07 4.53 4.17 4.34 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 1 0 2 1 11 4.40 736/1270 4.40 4.69 4.35 4.53 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 1 1 0 13 4.67 535/1269 4.67 4.73 4.35 4.55 4. Were special techniques successful 2 3 2 0 1 2 7 4.00 464/878 4.00 4.36 4.05 4.11 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 7 Major 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 S 1 Under-grad 10 Non-major								-	-	_	_								
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 0 0 1 14 4.47 731/1489 4.47 4.39 4.32 4.38 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 11 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 463/1277 4.33 4.10 4.03 4.08 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 0 2 2 9 4.07 783/1279 4.07 4.53 4.17 4.34 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 1 0 2 1 11 4.40 736/1270 4.40 4.69 4.35 4.53 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 1 1 0 13 4.67 535/1269 4.67 4.73 4.35 4.55 4. Were special techniques successful 2 3 2 0 1 2 7 4.00 464/878 4.00 4.36 4.05 4.11 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 7 Major 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 1 Under-grad 10 Non-major					3					_	-								4.88
Discussion Discus							-	-	-	_	-			,					4.59
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 0 2 2 9 4.07 783/1279 4.07 4.53 4.17 4.34 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 1 0 2 1 11 4.40 736/1270 4.40 4.69 4.35 4.53 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 1 1 0 13 4.67 535/1269 4.67 4.73 4.35 4.55 4. Were special techniques successful 2 3 2 0 1 2 7 4.00 464/878 4.00 4.36 4.05 4.11 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 7 Major 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 1 Under-grad 10 Non-major	<u>.</u>					-	-		-	-	_			- ,					
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 0 2 2 9 4.07 783/1279 4.07 4.53 4.17 4.34 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 1 0 2 1 11 4.40 736/1270 4.40 4.69 4.35 4.53 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 1 1 0 13 4.67 535/1269 4.67 4.73 4.35 4.55 4. Were special techniques successful 2 3 2 0 1 2 7 4.00 464/878 4.00 4.36 4.05 4.11 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 7 Major 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 1 Under-grad 10 Non-major	. Did au	.alovisua.	i tecnniques en	nance yo	ur understanding	U	11	U	U	1	2	3	4.33	463/12//	4.33	4.10	4.03	4.08	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 1 0 2 1 11 4.40 736/1270 4.40 4.69 4.35 4.53 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 1 1 0 13 4.67 535/1269 4.67 4.73 4.35 4.55 4. Were special techniques successful 2 3 2 0 1 2 7 4.00 464/878 4.00 4.36 4.05 4.11 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 7 Major 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 1 Under-grad 10 Non-major																			
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 1 1 0 13 4.67 535/1269 4.67 4.73 4.35 4.55 4. Were special techniques successful 2 3 2 0 1 2 7 4.00 464/878 4.00 4.36 4.05 4.11 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 7 Major 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 1 Under-grad 10 Non-major	. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	2	0	2	0	2	2	9	4.07	783/1279	4.07	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful 2 3 2 0 1 2 7 4.00 464/878 4.00 4.36 4.05 4.11 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 7 Major 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 1 Under-grad 10 Non-major	. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	couraged	to participate	2	0	1	0	2	1	11	4.40	736/1270	4.40	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.40
Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 7 Major 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 1 Under-grad 10 Non-major	. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair and	open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	0	13	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.67
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 7 Major 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 1 Under-grad 10 Non-major	. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		2	3	2	0	1	2	7	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.00
00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 7 Major 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 1 Under-grad 10 Non-major						ency	Dis	trib	utio	ı									
00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 7 Major 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 1 Under-grad 10 Non-major			-						D -					m				26	
28-55	realts E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons								pe 			Majors 	
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 1 Under-grad 10 Non-major	00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	7	Majo	or	11
04 150 0 2 00 2 40 1 5 0	56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	-major	6
04-150 U 5.00-3.49 I D U	84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad. 7 $3.50-4.00$ 5 F 0 Electives 0 $\#\#\#$ - Means there are not enough	Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Electives 0					0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h	
P $\hspace{.1cm} 0 \hspace{.1cm}$ responses to be significant					P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
I 0 Other 11					I 0		Ot1	her				1	.1						
? 2					? 2														

Course-Section: Educ 668 0101

Title Creating an E-Portfolio

Instructor: Huang, Yi Ping

Enrollment: 0

Questionnaires: 9

Baltimore County Spring 2009

University of Maryland

Page 4
JUL 2, 2009
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eane	ncie	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	_		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	3	2	4 00	1148/1576	****	4.51	4.30	4.11	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	0	1	2	2		1345/1576	****	4.33	4.27	4.11	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	1	0	0	1		****/1342	****	4.50	4.32	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	1	1	3		1041/1520	****	4.35	4.25	4.09	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	2	1	2		1166/1465	****	4.27	4.12	4.02	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	0		1142/1434	****	4.42	4.14	3.94	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	1	2	1		1303/1547	****	4.22	4.19	4.10	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	4	1		1367/1574	****	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	3	3		827/1554	****	4.24	4.10	4.01	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1233/1488	****	4.55	4.47	4.41	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	986/1493	****	4.90	4.73	4.65	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1215/1486	****	4.54	4.32	4.26	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	0	4	3.71	1270/1489	****	4.49	4.32	4.22	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	829/1277	****	4.26	4.03	3.91	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	,	****	4.66	4.17	3.96	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	,	****	4.76	4.35	4.09	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	,	****	4.81	4.35	4.09	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	631/ 878	****	4.28	4.05	3.91	3.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 234	****	4.47	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33		****	3.81	4.35	4.29	3.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 229		4.82	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 232		4.69	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 379	****	4.82	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	76/ 85	****	4.40	4.72	4.52	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	79/ 79	****	3.33	4.69	4.52	3.33
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6 6	0	0 1	0	1	1 1	1 1	4.00	70/ 80	****	4.00	4.61	4.55	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	ь	U	1	U	U	1	Τ	3.33	232/ 375	***	4.39	4.01	3.78	3.33
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	, -	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00		****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.96	4.03	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	36/ 40	****	3.67	4.60	4.44	3.67
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, -	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	****	4.95	4.08	3.86	****

Course-Section:
Title
Instructor:

0

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 4 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

University of Maryland

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 617 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 3 St	tudent Course Evaluation Questionnaire
----------------------	--

Course-Section: EDUC 669 0101

3

ASSESS READING SHELTON, NANCY

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questions							Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 I															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	w insights,skil		this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	4.50	4.42	4.30	4.43	5.00
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1576		4.37	4.27	4.32	4.67
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1520	4.27	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.67
				hat you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1465		4.29	4.12	4.25	5.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67			4.37	4.14		4.67
		system clearly		_	0	1	0	0	2	0	0		1459/1547		4.24	4.19	4.24	3.00
		was class cance	-	1100	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1574		4.80	4.64		5.00
	-			ing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		, -	4.07		4.10		5.00
		Lecture	ے															
1. Were +1	he instru	ctor's lectures		repared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	4.63	4.58	4.47	4.52	5.00
		tor seem inter	_	_	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1493		4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
				plained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1493		4.43	4.73		5.00
		eriai presence s contribute to			2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1489		4.43	4.32		5.00
					2	0	0	0	0	0								
5. Did aud	alovisual	tecnniques en	iance yo	ur understanding	2	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	1/1277	4.25	4.10	4.03	4.08	5.00
1 541		Discus		Jane 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	F 00	1 /1070	4 01	4 50	4 1 7	4 24	F 00
				hat you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279		4.53	4.17	4.34	5.00
	Were all students actively encouraged to participat Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussi				0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1270		4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00
	. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussio . Were special techniques successful				0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	773/1269		4.73	4.35	4.55	4.33
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	sstul		0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 878	4.42	4.36	4.05	4.11	5.00
1 5'1 5'		Field V			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	F 00	1 / 50	F 00	4 50	4 40	4 40	F 00
		ience contribut			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 52		4.79	4.48	4.40	5.00
_	_	understand you			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 48		4.41	4.40	4.76	5.00
		tor available i			0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/ 44		4.65	4.73	4.88	5.00
		could you disc			0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	24/ 45			4.57		4.67
5. Did con	nferences	help you carry	y out fi	eld activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	142/ 326	4.67	4.58	4.03	4.10	4.67
		Self I																
5. Were th	here enou	igh proctors for	r all th	e students	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.13	5.00
				Frequ	iency	Dis	tribu	ution	1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 0	A 3		Re	 muir		or Ma	iors		0	Graduat	 e	 1	 Мај	 or	0
	28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 0					1/6	2011C	-u 1	, ria	ء ـ ب	-	5	Graduati	_	_	ına J	J_	U
	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0			General 0 Under-grad 2				2	Non	-major	3							
	84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0					GE.	пста.	L				U	onder -g.	Lau	4	MOII-	iiia jul	3
					רים.	ectiv	700				0	#### - 1	Moana +	horo s	ro no	- onous	h	
Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 2 F 0					EI	EC LIV	/ CS				U					_	11	
				I 0		O+1	her					3	respons	es lo D	e sign	ıııcal	.16	
						Ut.	ner					3						
? 0																		

University of Maryland Page 618
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: EDUC 669 0201

9

ASSESS READING

SMALL, SUE ELLE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 9

Questions							Fre	_	ncies	\$		Inst	ructo	c	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rai	nk	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1																
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1148/	1576	4.50	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	2	2	4	1		1419/		4.06	4.37	4.27	4.32	3.44
		estions reflect			0	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	1342	***	4.68	4.32	4.38	****
		ations reflect			0	1	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1185/	1520	4.27	4.46	4.25	4.36	3.88
			_	hat you learned	0	0	0	0	5	2	2	3.67	1166/	1465	4.33	4.29	4.12	4.25	3.67
	_	-		what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	473/	1434	4.56	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.44
7. Was th	e grading	system clearly	y explai	ned .	0	0	2	0	1	4	2	3.44	1366/	1547	3.22	4.24	4.19	4.24	3.44
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	720/	1574	4.89	4.80	4.64	4.75	4.78
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	1	1	0	1	5	0	1	3.14	1420/	1554	4.07	4.08	4.10	4.18	3.14
		Lecture	e.																
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectures		repared	1	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	1111/	1488	4.63	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.25
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	1	7		632/		4.94	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.88
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearl						0	2	2	2	-		1330/		4.25	4.43	4.32	4.37	3.50
	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						1	1	2	2	2		1352/		4.19	4.39	4.32	4.38	3.38
	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandin						1	0	2	1	2		1020/			4.10	4.03		3.50
J. Dia aa	. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your diderstanding						-	Ü	_	_	-	3.30	1020/		1.23	1.10	1.03	1.00	3.30
		Discuss																	
				hat you learned	2	0	1	0	2	3			1097/		4.21	4.53	4.17	4.34	3.43
				l to participate	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	814/1		4.64	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.29
				l open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	803/			4.73	4.35	4.55	4.29
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		2	1	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	589/	878	4.42	4.36	4.05	4.11	3.83
		Semina	r																
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading made	e clear		6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/	375	5.00	4.22	4.01	4.10	5.00
		Self I	Paced																
5. Were t	here enou	igh proctors for		e students	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/	382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.13	5.00
				Frequ	ency	7 Dist	trib	ution	ı										
				_															
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	asons	;				Туј	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 6					Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors		0	Grad	duat	e	4	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0															
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				0	Unde	er-gi	rad	5	Non-	major	9
84-150																			
Grad. 4 3.50-4.00 5 F 0					Ele	ecti	ves				0	###	‡ – I	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh	
				P 0									resp	onse	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0	Other						6			3					
				? 1															

Course-Section: EDUC 678 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 619

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Title INST STRAT/DIV NEEDS Instructor: BERGE, NANCY B Spring 2009 Enrollment: 13

Questionnaires: 10

Ouestions							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 543		Genera	_	43-1	0	0	0	0	1	4	_	4 40	707/1576	4 40	4 40	4 20	4 42	4 40
		w insights,skil tor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	4	5 5	4.40	787/1576 759/1576	4.40	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.40 4.40
		estions reflect			0	9	0	0	0	1	0		,	4.4U ****	4.68	4.27	4.32	4.40 ****
		ations reflect			0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.00	921/1520	4.20	4.68	4.32	4.36	4.20
				hat you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	244/1465	4.20	4.40	4.12	4.25	4.70
	_	_		what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	748/1434	4.20	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.70
		system clearly		-	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.20	784/1547	4.20	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.20
		was class cance		illed	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	665/1574	4.80	4.24	4.19	4.75	4.80
				ing effectiveness	3	1	0	1	0	4	1		1110/1554	3.83	4.08	4.10		3.83
9. HOW WOL	iiu you g	rade the overa.	LI LEACI.	ing effectiveness	3	_	U		U	4		3.03	1110/1554	3.03	4.00	4.10	4.10	3.03
		Lecture	2															
1 Were th	ne instru	ctor's lecture		repared	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	786/1488	4.57	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.57
		tor seem inter	_	-	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	607/1493	4.89	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.89
				plained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	763/1486	4.44	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.44
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	766/1489	4.44	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	366/1277		4.10	4.03	4.08	4.44
		1000000											,					
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ite to w	hat you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	510/1279	4.44	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.44
2. Were al	ll studen	ts actively end	couraged	to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.67
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage :	air and	open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	614/1269	4.56	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.56
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful	_	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.33
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 9					or Ma	iore		0	Graduat		6	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		1000	<u> Juri</u> e	su I	JI M	LJOLA	•	U	Graduati	5	U	Maje)_	U
56-83					Ger	neral	1				0	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	10	
84-150						061		-				J	onaci -g.	Laa	•	14011		10
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	8	F 0		E14	ectiv	7es				0	#### - I	Means +	here a	re not	enous	h
oraa.	J	3.30 1.00	5	P 0		1110	C I \	,				J	response				_	11
I 0					O+1	ner				1	0	_ copone.		5191				
? 1					001					_	-							

Course-Section: EDUC 679 0101

Title OBSERVATION & ASSESSME

Instructor: SMALL, SUE ELLE

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 7 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 620 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1420/1576	3.57	4.42	4.30	4.43	3.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1428/1576	3.43	4.37	4.27	4.32	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1130/1465	3.71	4.29	4.12	4.25	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1117/1434	3.71	4.37	4.14	4.35	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1373/1547	3.43	4.24	4.19	4.24	3.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1025/1574	4.57	4.80	4.64	4.75	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1334/1488	3.83	4.58	4.47	4.52	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1053/1493	4.67	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	1375/1486	3.33	4.43	4.32	4.37	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	2	2	3.67	1283/1489	3.67	4.39	4.32	4.38	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1119/1277	3.20	4.10	4.03	4.08	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	981/1279	3.71	4.53	4.17	4.34	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	458/1270	4.71	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	602/1269	4.57	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.79	4.48	4.40	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48	****	4.41	4.40	4.76	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 45	****	4.39	4.57	4.65	****
1. 11 Hall sales for all discounts four discounts	Ü	Ü	,	,	,	-	Ū		, 13				00	
Frequ	Dist	cribu	ution	า										

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

Course-Section: EDUC 688 0101

Title METHODOLOGY TEACH ESL

Instructor: NELSON, JOHN E

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 14

NELSON, JOHN E.

Spring 2009

Page 621 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	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 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	0 0 0 1 2	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 3 0 2	14 11 13 9	5.00 5.00 4.79 5.00 4.67	1/1576 1/1576 263/1342 1/1520 264/1465	5.00 5.00 4.79 5.00 4.67	4.42 4.37 4.68 4.46 4.29	4.30 4.27 4.32 4.25 4.12	4.43 4.32 4.38 4.36 4.25	5.00 5.00 4.79 5.00 4.67
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 1 1 4	0 0 0 1	0 0 0 1	0 0 0	0 1 0 0	0 1 0 2	13 11 13 6	5.00 4.77 5.00 4.33	1/1574	5.00 4.77 5.00 4.33	4.37 4.24 4.80 4.08	4.14 4.19 4.64 4.10	4.35 4.24 4.75 4.18	5.00 4.77 5.00 4.33
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	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 5	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 2	0 0 0 0	0 0 2 0 1	14 12 14	5.00 5.00 4.86 5.00 3.56	1/1488 1/1493 221/1486 1/1489 997/1277	5.00 5.00 4.86 5.00 3.56	4.58 4.80 4.43 4.39 4.10	4.47 4.73 4.32 4.32 4.03	4.52 4.80 4.37 4.38 4.08	5.00 5.00 4.86 5.00 3.56
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	1 1 1	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 0 1	12 13 12 12	4.92 5.00 4.92 4.92	135/1279 1/1270 222/1269 93/ 878	4.92 5.00 4.92 4.92		4.17 4.35 4.35 4.05	4.34 4.53 4.55 4.11	4.92 5.00 4.92 4.92
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13 13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 234 ****/ 240	**** ***	3.08 3.47	4.23 4.35	4.36 4.37	* * * * * * *
Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities Self Paced	11	0	0	0	0	0			****/ 326		1.50		4.10	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students Frequ	13 lency	0 Dist	0 cribu	0 utior	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	^^^	5.00	4.08	4.13	***
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe 			Majors	
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 1 A 11 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0			quire		or Maj	jor		0	Graduate Under-g		.0	Majo Non-	or -major	10
Grad. 4 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 0		Ele Oth	ectiv ner	ves			1	0	#### - I respons				_	h

Course-Section: EDUC 689I 0101 University of Maryland Page 622 Title INEQUALITY IN EDUCATIO Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009

Instructor: STAFF Enrollment: 1 Questionnaires: 1

Spring 2009

Ctudent	Course	Fraluation	Ouestionnaire	
Student.	COURSE	r.valual ion	Ouesi Tonna i re	

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.46	4.25	4.36	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.29	4.12	4.25	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.37	4.14	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.24	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.53	4.17	4.34	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00
Self Paced														
	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.25	4.60	4.50	F 00
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	-	0	1		-,					5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.83	4.80	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.08	4.67	4.33	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.78	4.75	5.00
Frequ	Frequency Distribution													

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

Course-Section: EDUC 772 8020 University of Maryland EVALUATION & ASSESSMEN Baltimore County

Page 623 JUL 2, 2009 Title Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: SCHAFFER, EUGEN

Enrollment:	1	
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	1	0	0	3.00	1539/1576	3.80	4.42	4.30	4.43	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1138/1576	4.15	4.37	4.27	4.32	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1041/1520	4.18	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	4.75	4.29	4.12	4.25	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	ed 0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	878/1434	4.25	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	4.30	4.24	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes	ss 0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.22	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	4.90	4.58	4.47	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1101/1486	4.25	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.85	4.39	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	692/1277	4.25	4.10	4.03	4.08	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	4.93	4.53	4.17	4.34	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	4.82	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	n 0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	4.93	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	464/ 878	4.13	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.00
Fre	quency	7 Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum GPA Expected Grade	·s			Rea	asons				Τvi	ne .			Majors	

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

Course-Section: EDUC 772 8720 Title

EVALUATION & ASSESSMEN

Instructor: SCHAFFER, EUGEN

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 624 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	500/1576	3.80	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	891/1576		4.37	4.27		4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1342		4.68	4.32	4.38	***
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	7	11	4.35	744/1520	4.18	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	4.50	366/1465	4.75	4.29	4.12	4.25	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	398/1434	4.25	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	5	7	5	3.60	1303/1547	4.30	4.24	4.19	4.24	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	477/1554	4.22	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	401/1488	4.90	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	2	15	4.50	678/1486	4.25	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	461/1489	4.85	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	309/1277	4.25	4.10	4.03	4.08	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	194/1279	4.93	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	514/1270	4.82	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	332/1269	4.93	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	361/ 878	4.13	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.26
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.58	4.03	4.10	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.13	****
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 6 0.00-0.99 1 A 20		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor		0	Graduat	 e 1	.1	Majo	 or	0

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	 А	20	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	11	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	9	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20	_		_	
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: EDUC 791P 0101

Title PRACTICUM IN ED SEC 7-

Instructor: MURPHY, JOYCE A

Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 13

13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 625 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions					NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did you	ı gain new	insights,ski		this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	697/1576	4.46	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.46
2. Did the	e instructo	or make clear	the exp	ected goals	0	0	1	1	4	3	4	3.62	1364/1576	3.62	4.37	4.27	4.32	3.62
3. Did the	e exam ques	stions reflec	t the ex	pected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1342	****	4.68	4.32	4.38	****
4. Did oth	ner evaluat	tions reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	0	2	0	1	8	2	3.62	1325/1520	3.62	4.46	4.25	4.36	3.62
5. Did ass	signed read	dings contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	0	0	1	1	2	6	3	3.69	1145/1465	3.69	4.29	4.12	4.25	3.69
6. Did wri	itten assig	gnments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	6	3	3.62	1167/1434	3.62	4.37	4.14	4.35	3.62
		system clearl		ned	0	0	2	1	3	4	3		1384/1547		4.24	4.19	4.24	3.38
	-	as class canc			0	0	0	0	0	1	12		375/1574		4.80	4.64	4.75	4.92
9. How wou	ıld you gra	ade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	6	2	3.73	1187/1554	3.73	4.08	4.10	4.18	3.73
		Lectur	е															
		tor's lecture	_	-	2	0	0	3	0	3	5		1316/1488		4.58	4.47	4.52	3.91
		or seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	5	6		1176/1493		4.80	4.73	4.80	4.55
				plained clearly	2	0	1	0	0	5	5		1010/1486		4.43	4.32	4.37	4.18
		contribute t			2	0	1	0	2	3	5		1118/1489		4.39	4.32	4.38	4.00
5. Did aud	diovisual t	techniques en	hance yo	ur understanding	2	2	1	0	1	6	1	3.67	943/1277	3.67	4.10	4.03	4.08	3.67
1. Did cla	ass discus	hat you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	358/1279	4.64	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.64		
		_	_	to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	260/1270	4.91	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.91
				open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	375/1269		4.73	4.35	4.55	4.82
4. Were sp	pecial tech	nniques succe	ssful		2	3	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	367/ 878	4.25	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.25
		Semina	r															
				announced theme	4	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	75/ 85		4.41	4.72	4.79	4.11
				vidual attention	4	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	76/ 79		4.54	4.69	4.77	3.78
		•		hat you learned	4	0	2	1	0	2	4	3.56	71/ 72		4.46	4.64	4.70	3.56
_		s contribute		you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	57/ 80		4.31	4.61	4.70	4.44
5. Were cr	riteria fo	r grading mad	e clear		4	0	1	2	0	3	3	3.56	207/ 375	3.56	4.22	4.01	4.10	3.56
		Field																
				at you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 52		4.79	4.48	4.40	****
				ation criteria	11 10	0	0	0	0	0	2 1	5.00	****/ 48		4.41	4.40	4.76	****
4. To what	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations					1	0	0	U	1	1	4.50	****/ 45	^^^	4.39	4.57	4.65	* * * *
	Fi							utior	1									
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	1			
00-27	00-27 3 0.00-0.99 2 A 13						auir	ed fo	or Ma	iors	 3	0	 Graduat	 e	 7	 Мајо	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0						,	-	-	or adda	-	•			ŭ
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-9	rad	6	Non-	-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									_				-	
Grad.	rad. 7 3.50-4.00 6 F 0					Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	h
	P 0												respons				_	
	I 0				Oth	ner				1	2	_		_				
		3 0																

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

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 626

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

TIISCIUC	· LOI •	WILDON,
Enrollm	nent:	5

Enrollment:	5			
Questionnaires:	4	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	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	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1445/1576	3.50	4.42	4.30	4.43	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1311/1576	3.75	4.37	4.27	4.32	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1256/1520	3.75	4.46	4.25	4.36	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.29	4.12	4.25	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0 E	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1093/1434	3.75	4.37	4.14	4.35	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1553/1554	1.00	4.08	4.10	4.18	1.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.58	4.47	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	2		1283/1489	3.67	4.39	4.32	4.38	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1219/1277	2.67	4.10	4.03	4.08	2.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	827/1270	4.25	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1036/1269	3.75	4.73	4.35	4.55	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	843/ 878	2.67	4.36	4.05	4.11	2.67
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.13	5.00
Fred	quency	y Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	5			Re	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 0		Re	equir	ed i	or Ma	ijors	5	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	3
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0		Co	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	4	Non	major	1
		GE	шета.	_				U	onder-9	Lau	7	NOII-	ma jul	т
84-150 0 3 00-3 49 0 5 0														
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0		E.I	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means +	here a	re not	enoug	rh
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	h
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0			ecti	ves				0	#### - : respons				_	h

Course-Section: EDUC 792L 0101

Title

INT IN EDU TESOL K-12 Instructor:

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 6

STEIN, HOLLIS G

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 627 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	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	0	2	4	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	197/1520	4.80	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1242/1465	3.50	4.29	4.12	4.25	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	777/1434	4.17	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	755/1547	4.33	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.08	4.10	4.18	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.58	4.47	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	692/1277	4.00	4.10	4.03	4.08	4.00
5. Fin and over the committee committee four and or boarding	_	_	Ü	Ů	-	Ů	_	1.00	0,2,22,,	1.00	1.10	1.00	1.00	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	5.00		4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	221/ 878	4.50		4.05	4.11	
									,					
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.47	4.35	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.41	4.72	4.79	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.54	4.69	4.77	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	48/ 80	4.50	4.31	4.61	4.70	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	146/ 375	4.67	4.22	4.01	4.10	4.67
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.79	4.48	4.40	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.41	4.40	4.76	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.65	4.73	4.88	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	27/ 45	4.50	4.39	4.57	4.65	4.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.58	4.03	4.10	5.00
Self Paced		•					_						4 = 0	- 00
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4 4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.25	4.60	4.50	5.00
. Did study questions make clear the expected goal		1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.80	****
. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful		0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.08	4.67	4.33	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.13	****

Course-Section: EDUC 792L 0101

Title INT IN EDU TESOL K-12

Instructor: STEIN, HOLLIS G

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 627 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: KINERNEY, DONNA Enrollment: 4

Questionnaires: 4

Page 628 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ctudant	('011760	Evaluation	Ougetion	סמוכמו

						Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4			_		ructor	Course	_		Level			
		Questions	; 		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil	ls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.50
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.32	4.50
		estions reflect			0	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.68	4.32	4.38	4.00
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.50
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	0		1102/1465	3.75	4.29	4.12	4.25	3.75
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.50
		system clearly		_	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	838/1547	4.25	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.25
	-	was class cance	_	ined	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1574		4.80	4.64	4.75	5.00
				hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1					4.10		4.33
3. 110W WO	ara you s	jidde elle overdi	- ccac	ning circociveness	_	J	O	O	J	_	_	1.55	023/1331	1.55	1.00	1.10	1.10	1.55
		Lecture	:															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectures	well	prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.58	4.47	4.52	5.00
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor seem intere	sted i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presented	l and e	xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.00
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to	what	you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.50
				our understanding	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1274/1277	1.00	4.10	4.03	4.08	1.00
		-	-	3														
	Discussion																	
1. Did cl	Did class discussions contribute to what you learne						0	0	0	1	0	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.00
2. Were a	ıll studer	nts actively end	ourage	d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00
				d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	sful	-	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.00
		Seminar					_	•		_		4 = 0		4 = 0		4 = 0	4 =0	4 = 0
				announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	61/ 85	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.79	4.50
				ividual attention	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	46/ 79	4.75	4.54	4.69	4.77	4.75
	_	-		what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	4.46	4.64	4.70	5.00
		ons contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	48/ 80	4.50	4.31	4.61		4.50
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading made	clear		0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	199/ 375	3.75	4.22	4.01	4.10	3.75
		Self F																
5 Were t	here eno	sell F ligh proctors for		he students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1 / 382	5.00	5 00	4 08	4 13	5 00
J. WCIC C	nere enoc	igh proceors for	all c	iic beddeireb	,	U	O	O	U	O	_	3.00	1/ 302	3.00	3.00	1.00	1.13	3.00
	F						trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade								Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 1	G 1							•		,	4			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General						0	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	-major	4	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0								_						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	уh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sigr	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner					3						
	? 0			? 0														

Course-Section: EDUC 797 0101 Title

INTERNSHIP SEM IN SEC

Instructor: OLIVA, LINDA M.

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 8

Baltimore County Spring 2009

University of Maryland

Page 629 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	emie	ncies	=		Tnet	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	I.evel	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_		4	5	Mean	Rank				Mean	
x 400 010110														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	0	3	3.63	1401/1576	3.63	4.42	4.30	4.43	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	1	2	1	2.88	1546/1576	2.88	4.37	4.27	4.32	2.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1342	****	4.68	4.32	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1386/1465	3.00	4.29	4.12	4.25	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	1	2	1	2.86	1397/1434	2.86	4.37	4.14	4.35	2.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	1255/1547	3.71	4.24	4.19	4.24	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	527/1574	4.88	4.80	4.64	4.75	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1267/1554	3.60	4.08	4.10	4.18	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	1048/1488	4.33	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	241/1486	4.83	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	3	1		1298/1489	3.60	4.39	4.32	4.38	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	533/1277	4.25	4.10	4.03	4.08	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	641/1279	4.29	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3 7	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.69	4.17	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/12/0	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	415/ 878			4.35		4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	U	U	4		3	4.1/	413/ 0/0	4.1/	4.30	4.05	4.11	4.1/
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	81/ 85	3.75	4.41	4.72	4.79	3.75
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	46/ 79	4.75	4.54	4.69	4.77	4.75
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	69/ 72	3.75	4.46	4.64	4.70	3.75
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	77/ 80	3.75	4.31	4.61	4.70	3.75
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	152/ 375	4.50	4.22	4.01	4.10	4.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.79	4.48	4.40	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	35/ 48	4.00	4.41	4.40	4.76	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	33/ 44	4.75	4.65	4.73	4.88	4.75
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	36/ 45	4.25	4.39	4.57	4.65	4.25
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	164/ 326	3.75	4.58	4.03	4.10	3.75
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.25	4.60	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.08	4.67	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 382		5.00	4.08	4.13	****
	•	-	-	-	-	-	_		, 302					
Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									

Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 8 .