

Course-Section: EDUC 311 01
 Title Psyc Foundation Of Edu
 Instructor: Williams,Vickie
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 509
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	1	10	4.19	936/1447	4.01	4.35	4.31	4.32	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	11	4.38	715/1447	4.37	4.30	4.27	4.23	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	4	7	3.88	1008/1241	3.99	4.66	4.33	4.33	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	217/1402	4.61	4.38	4.24	4.24	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	551/1358	4.18	4.17	4.11	4.10	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	166/1316	4.59	4.37	4.14	4.13	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	147/1427	4.75	4.33	4.19	4.15	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	565/1447	4.78	4.79	4.69	4.65	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	712/1434	4.06	4.14	4.10	4.09	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	755/1387	4.59	4.47	4.46	4.44	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	784/1387	4.84	4.81	4.73	4.71	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	0	1	12	4.53	577/1386	4.56	4.40	4.32	4.30	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	0	1	11	4.27	877/1380	4.22	4.34	4.32	4.32	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	624/1193	4.13	4.06	4.02	4.05	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	5	1	3.63	947/1172	4.31	4.42	4.15	4.24	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	737/1182	4.54	4.61	4.35	4.42	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	679/1170	4.60	4.67	4.38	4.49	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	423/ 800	4.25	4.29	4.06	4.12	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors		9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: EDUC 311 02
 Title Psyc Foundation Of Edu
 Instructor: Williams,Vickie
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 510
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	6	3	8	3.84	1206/1447	4.01	4.35	4.31	4.32	3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	11	4.37	728/1447	4.37	4.30	4.27	4.23	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	7	8	4.11	878/1241	3.99	4.66	4.33	4.33	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	530/1402	4.61	4.38	4.24	4.24	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	4	9	4.06	772/1358	4.18	4.17	4.11	4.10	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	476/1316	4.59	4.37	4.14	4.13	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	16	4.68	265/1427	4.75	4.33	4.19	4.15	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	938/1447	4.78	4.79	4.69	4.65	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	8	3	3.93	942/1434	4.06	4.14	4.10	4.09	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	596/1387	4.59	4.47	4.46	4.44	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	579/1387	4.84	4.81	4.73	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	529/1386	4.56	4.40	4.32	4.30	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	952/1380	4.22	4.34	4.32	4.32	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	2	1	1	11	4.19	536/1193	4.13	4.06	4.02	4.05	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1172	4.31	4.42	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	271/1182	4.54	4.61	4.35	4.42	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	295/1170	4.60	4.67	4.38	4.49	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	195/ 800	4.25	4.29	4.06	4.12	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 17	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 19	Non-major 18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: EDUC 313 1
 Title Peer Assisted Lrning I
 Instructor: Bichy,Cassie L
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 511
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1058/1447	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1053/1447	4.00	4.30	4.27	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	923/1241	4.00	4.66	4.33	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	976/1402	4.00	4.38	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	799/1358	4.00	4.17	4.11	4.10	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	812/1316	4.00	4.37	4.14	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	971/1427	4.00	4.33	4.19	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	849/1434	4.00	4.14	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1176/1387	4.00	4.47	4.46	4.44	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.81	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1047/1386	4.00	4.40	4.32	4.30	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1030/1380	4.00	4.34	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1087/1193	3.00	4.06	4.02	4.05	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.42	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.61	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.67	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.29	4.06	4.12	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 314 1
 Title Peer Assisted Lrning I
 Instructor: Bichy,Cassie L
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 512
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1198/1447	3.86	4.35	4.31	4.32	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	956/1447	4.14	4.30	4.27	4.23	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1241	****	4.66	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	735/1402	4.29	4.38	4.24	4.24	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	1	0	2.57	1337/1358	2.57	4.17	4.11	4.10	2.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	812/1316	4.00	4.37	4.14	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1110/1427	3.86	4.33	4.19	4.15	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1031/1434	3.83	4.14	4.10	4.09	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	881/1387	4.43	4.47	4.46	4.44	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	656/1387	4.86	4.81	4.73	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	719/1386	4.43	4.40	4.32	4.30	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1030/1380	4.00	4.34	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	895/1193	3.67	4.06	4.02	4.05	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.42	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.61	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.67	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.29	4.06	4.12	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 388 01
 Title Inclusion & Instructio
 Instructor: Wilson-Craig,Es
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 513
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	4	3	7	3.88	1182/1447	3.88	4.35	4.31	4.32	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	532/1447	4.50	4.30	4.27	4.23	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1241	****	4.66	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	3	2	9	4.27	756/1402	4.27	4.38	4.24	4.24	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	2	1	8	3.63	1111/1358	3.63	4.17	4.11	4.10	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	4	8	4.13	738/1316	4.13	4.37	4.14	4.13	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	1	12	4.56	385/1427	4.56	4.33	4.19	4.15	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	565/1447	4.88	4.79	4.69	4.65	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	454/1434	4.40	4.14	4.10	4.09	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	475/1387	4.73	4.47	4.46	4.44	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	758/1387	4.82	4.81	4.73	4.71	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	470/1386	4.64	4.40	4.32	4.30	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	0	9	4.55	615/1380	4.55	4.34	4.32	4.32	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	652/1193	4.00	4.06	4.02	4.05	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	841/1172	3.83	4.42	4.15	4.24	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	271/1182	4.83	4.61	4.35	4.42	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	576/1170	4.50	4.67	4.38	4.49	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	380/ 800	4.17	4.29	4.06	4.12	4.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 1	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 16	Non-major 17
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	4	5	11	3.96	1108/1447	3.76	4.35	4.31	4.43	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	3	2	13	4.05	1029/1447	4.10	4.30	4.27	4.31	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	478/1241	4.57	4.66	4.33	4.41	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	5	3	11	4.00	976/1402	4.04	4.38	4.24	4.34	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	1	3	3	10	3.43	1199/1358	3.68	4.17	4.11	4.15	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	1	2	3	13	4.00	812/1316	3.88	4.37	4.14	4.27	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	3	3	11	3.70	1188/1427	3.97	4.33	4.19	4.20	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	700/1447	4.83	4.79	4.69	4.72	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	6	7	4	3.68	1137/1434	3.77	4.14	4.10	4.17	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	536/1387	4.56	4.47	4.46	4.48	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	630/1387	4.77	4.81	4.73	4.76	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	3	15	4.50	607/1386	4.27	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	4	12	4.05	1016/1380	3.81	4.34	4.32	4.34	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	288/1193	4.25	4.06	4.02	4.00	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	1	3	12	4.33	521/1172	4.40	4.42	4.15	4.25	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	271/1182	4.80	4.61	4.35	4.49	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	515/1170	4.65	4.67	4.38	4.51	4.61
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	6	2	9	4.18	375/ 800	4.43	4.29	4.06	4.19	4.18
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	4.74	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.56	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.52	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 64	****	4.35	4.09	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.55	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.19	4.25	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.68	4.52	4.72	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.39	4.30	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.45	4.43	4.62	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 21	Required for Majors 21	Graduate 7 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 16 Non-major 23
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00 15	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 410 02
 Title Read Contnt Area I
 Instructor: North-Coleman,C
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 515
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	2	4	6	9	3.56	1321/1447	3.76	4.35	4.31	4.43	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	8	11	4.16	938/1447	4.10	4.30	4.27	4.31	4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1241	4.57	4.66	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	2	11	9	4.08	923/1402	4.04	4.38	4.24	4.34	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	9	10	3.92	893/1358	3.68	4.17	4.11	4.15	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	3	8	9	3.76	991/1316	3.88	4.37	4.14	4.27	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	7	13	4.24	799/1427	3.97	4.33	4.19	4.20	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	646/1447	4.83	4.79	4.69	4.72	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	1	3	2	8	8	3.86	1010/1434	3.77	4.14	4.10	4.17	3.86

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	7	12	4.43	881/1387	4.56	4.47	4.46	4.48	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	982/1387	4.77	4.81	4.73	4.76	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	4	2	4	11	4.05	1030/1386	4.27	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	1	3	5	8	3.57	1226/1380	3.81	4.34	4.32	4.34	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	2	2	2	2	12	4.00	652/1193	4.25	4.06	4.02	4.00	4.00

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	411/1172	4.40	4.42	4.15	4.25	4.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	338/1182	4.80	4.61	4.35	4.49	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	459/1170	4.65	4.67	4.38	4.51	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	121/ 800	4.43	4.29	4.06	4.19	4.69

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 21	Required for Majors 23	Graduate	6	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3					
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major 25
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D 0					
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	11	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	0			
				? 0					

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	5	6	2	3.38	1364/1447	3.79	4.35	4.31	4.43	3.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	4	5	3.63	1278/1447	3.71	4.30	4.27	4.31	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1241	4.80	4.66	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	1	4	6	3.93	1056/1402	4.13	4.38	4.24	4.34	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	5	4	2	3.31	1240/1358	3.72	4.17	4.11	4.15	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	4	5	4	3.79	979/1316	4.11	4.37	4.14	4.27	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	6	6	4.00	971/1427	3.80	4.33	4.19	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	1175/1447	4.62	4.79	4.69	4.72	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	6	3	3	3.62	1181/1434	3.89	4.14	4.10	4.17	3.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	1124/1387	4.28	4.47	4.46	4.48	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	1222/1387	4.54	4.81	4.73	4.76	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	979/1386	4.17	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	4	7	3.87	1123/1380	4.11	4.34	4.32	4.34	3.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	1	3	7	4.08	624/1193	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.00	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	637/1172	4.36	4.42	4.15	4.25	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	430/1182	4.79	4.61	4.35	4.49	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	576/1170	4.70	4.67	4.38	4.51	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	159/ 800	4.58	4.29	4.06	4.19	4.60
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 66	****	4.74	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 62	****	4.56	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.52	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 64	****	4.35	4.09	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	4.00	4.55	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 36	3.40	4.19	4.25	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.68	4.52	4.72	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 30	****	4.39	4.30	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.45	4.43	4.62	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.72	4.80	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.64	4.60	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 15	Required for Majors 15
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 1	
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 15
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Non-major 16
					Electives 1
					#### - Means there are not enough

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	4	8	4.20	927/1447	3.79	4.35	4.31	4.43	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	4	5	3.80	1210/1447	3.71	4.30	4.27	4.31	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	231/1241	4.80	4.66	4.33	4.41	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	685/1402	4.13	4.38	4.24	4.34	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	3	9	4.13	718/1358	3.72	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	476/1316	4.11	4.37	4.14	4.27	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	4	4	4	3.60	1228/1427	3.80	4.33	4.19	4.20	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	592/1447	4.62	4.79	4.69	4.72	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	733/1434	3.89	4.14	4.10	4.17	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	881/1387	4.28	4.47	4.46	4.48	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	919/1387	4.54	4.81	4.73	4.76	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	911/1386	4.17	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	799/1380	4.11	4.34	4.32	4.34	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	555/1193	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.00	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	355/1172	4.36	4.42	4.15	4.25	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	198/1182	4.79	4.61	4.35	4.49	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	223/1170	4.70	4.67	4.38	4.51	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	177/ 800	4.58	4.29	4.06	4.19	4.56
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 192	****	4.67	4.34	4.61	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	32/ 38	4.00	4.55	4.49	4.68	4.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	31/ 36	3.40	4.19	4.25	4.42	3.40
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 28	****	4.68	4.52	4.72	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 30	****	4.39	4.30	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 27	****	4.45	4.43	4.62	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.72	4.80	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.64	4.60	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 15	Non-major 15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: EDUC 414 01
 Title Adolescent Literature
 Instructor: North-Coleman,C
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 518
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	3	5	3.79	1245/1447	3.79	4.35	4.31	4.43	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	1123/1447	3.93	4.30	4.27	4.31	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1241	****	4.66	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	3	3.79	1148/1402	3.79	4.38	4.24	4.34	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	4	2	4	3.36	1226/1358	3.36	4.17	4.11	4.15	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	5	1	6	3.79	979/1316	3.79	4.37	4.14	4.27	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	5	3	3	3.43	1284/1427	3.43	4.33	4.19	4.20	3.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	786/1447	4.79	4.79	4.69	4.72	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	5	5	2	3.75	1088/1434	3.75	4.14	4.10	4.17	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	698/1387	4.57	4.47	4.46	4.48	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	656/1387	4.86	4.81	4.73	4.76	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	855/1386	4.29	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	858/1380	4.29	4.34	4.32	4.34	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	737/1193	3.93	4.06	4.02	4.00	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	3	2	3	3.40	1024/1172	3.40	4.42	4.15	4.25	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	553/1182	4.50	4.61	4.35	4.49	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	522/1170	4.60	4.67	4.38	4.51	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	402/ 800	4.11	4.29	4.06	4.19	4.11
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 192	****	4.67	4.34	4.61	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.74	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.56	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.52	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 64	****	4.35	4.09	4.43	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 3	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 11	Non-major 14
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: EDUC 416 01
 Title Materials Tch Read
 Instructor: Shelton,Nancy R
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 519
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	829/1447	4.29	4.35	4.31	4.43	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	2	5	4	6	3.82	1196/1447	3.82	4.30	4.27	4.31	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	10	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	478/1241	4.57	4.66	4.33	4.41	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	1	2	1	5	7	3.94	1046/1402	3.94	4.38	4.24	4.34	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	681/1358	4.18	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	2	8	5	4.00	812/1316	4.00	4.37	4.14	4.27	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	4	3	3	1	5	3.00	1359/1427	3.00	4.33	4.19	4.20	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	5	4	5	3.69	1137/1434	3.69	4.14	4.10	4.17	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	1137/1387	4.12	4.47	4.46	4.48	4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	934/1387	4.71	4.81	4.73	4.76	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	7	2	7	3.88	1137/1386	3.88	4.40	4.32	4.34	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	5	2	9	4.12	990/1380	4.12	4.34	4.32	4.34	4.12
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	737/1193	3.92	4.06	4.02	4.00	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	521/1172	4.33	4.42	4.15	4.25	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	553/1182	4.50	4.61	4.35	4.49	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	710/1170	4.33	4.67	4.38	4.51	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	2	1	2	7	4.17	380/ 800	4.17	4.29	4.06	4.19	4.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	6	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Course-Section: EDUC 418 01
 Title Instruction Of Reading
 Instructor: Shelton,Nancy R
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 520
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	3	1	6	8	3.89	1166/1447	3.89	4.35	4.31	4.43	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	3	6	3	4	3.11	1391/1447	3.11	4.30	4.27	4.31	3.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	541/1241	4.50	4.66	4.33	4.41	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	2	6	3	5	3.53	1256/1402	3.53	4.38	4.24	4.34	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	1	5	10	4.00	799/1358	4.00	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	7	5	5	3.72	1014/1316	3.72	4.37	4.14	4.27	3.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	7	4	2	3	2	2.39	1404/1427	2.39	4.33	4.19	4.20	2.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	3	1	2	3	2	3.00	1349/1434	3.00	4.14	4.10	4.17	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	2	5	9	4.11	1137/1387	4.11	4.47	4.46	4.48	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	2	15	4.67	982/1387	4.67	4.81	4.73	4.76	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	5	5	4	3.53	1253/1386	3.53	4.40	4.32	4.34	3.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	4	4	7	3.88	1113/1380	3.88	4.34	4.32	4.34	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	2	3	7	4	3.65	905/1193	3.65	4.06	4.02	4.00	3.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	8	3	3.86	830/1172	3.86	4.42	4.15	4.25	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	1	2	8	4.15	796/1182	4.15	4.61	4.35	4.49	4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	4	1	3	5	3.69	1004/1170	3.69	4.67	4.38	4.51	3.69
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	2	4	2	4	3.67	612/ 800	3.67	4.29	4.06	4.19	3.67
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 192	****	4.67	4.34	4.61	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	1	11	4.50	23/ 38	4.50	4.55	4.49	4.68	4.50
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	4	3	2	5	3.57	30/ 36	3.57	4.19	4.25	4.42	3.57
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	2	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	22/ 28	4.33	4.68	4.52	4.72	4.33
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	1	2	1	2	5	3	3.46	27/ 30	3.46	4.39	4.30	4.38	3.46
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	3	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	25/ 27	3.73	4.45	4.43	4.62	3.73

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 8	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	11	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: EDUC 419 01
 Title Assess Reading
 Instructor: Small,Sue E
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 521
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	7	3	3.87	1190/1447	3.87	4.35	4.31	4.43	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	4	3.87	1168/1447	3.87	4.30	4.27	4.31	3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1241	****	4.66	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	380/1402	4.60	4.38	4.24	4.34	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	881/1358	3.93	4.17	4.11	4.15	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	362/1316	4.53	4.37	4.14	4.27	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	422/1427	4.53	4.33	4.19	4.20	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	339/1447	4.93	4.79	4.69	4.72	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	5	4	2	3.58	1198/1434	3.58	4.14	4.10	4.17	3.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	1153/1387	4.07	4.47	4.46	4.48	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	1081/1387	4.57	4.81	4.73	4.76	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1155/1386	3.85	4.40	4.32	4.34	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	4	4	3.71	1181/1380	3.71	4.34	4.32	4.34	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1136/1193	2.75	4.06	4.02	4.00	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	881/1172	3.75	4.42	4.15	4.25	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	347/1182	4.75	4.61	4.35	4.49	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	390/1170	4.75	4.67	4.38	4.51	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	398/ 800	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.19	4.13
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.55	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 36	****	4.19	4.25	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.68	4.52	4.72	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 30	****	4.39	4.30	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.45	4.43	4.62	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	6	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 421 01
 Title Tchng Science: Elem Sc
 Instructor: Blunck,Susan M
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 522
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.35	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	89/1447	4.93	4.30	4.27	4.31	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.66	4.33	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	129/1402	4.86	4.38	4.24	4.34	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.17	4.11	4.15	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.37	4.14	4.27	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.33	4.19	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	436/1447	4.92	4.79	4.69	4.72	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	149/1434	4.77	4.14	4.10	4.17	4.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.47	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.81	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	127/1380	4.93	4.34	4.32	4.34	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	112/1193	4.79	4.06	4.02	4.00	4.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	99/1172	4.93	4.42	4.15	4.25	4.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.61	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.67	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	63/ 800	4.93	4.29	4.06	4.19	4.93
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	29/ 38	4.29	4.55	4.49	4.68	4.29
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	13/ 36	4.71	4.19	4.25	4.42	4.71
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	2	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	15/ 28	4.75	4.68	4.52	4.72	4.75
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	1	0	1	1	11	4.50	10/ 30	4.50	4.39	4.30	4.38	4.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	2	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	13/ 27	4.67	4.45	4.43	4.62	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	5	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: EDUC 422 01
 Title Social Studies: Elem S
 Instructor: Fitzhugh,Willia
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 523
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	927/1447	4.20	4.35	4.31	4.43	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	766/1447	4.33	4.30	4.27	4.31	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.66	4.33	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	616/1402	4.40	4.38	4.24	4.34	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	280/1358	4.60	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	292/1316	4.60	4.37	4.14	4.27	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	337/1427	4.60	4.33	4.19	4.20	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	754/1434	4.14	4.14	4.10	4.17	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	398/1387	4.78	4.47	4.46	4.48	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	982/1387	4.67	4.81	4.73	4.76	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	290/1386	4.78	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	604/1380	4.56	4.34	4.32	4.34	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	602/1193	4.11	4.06	4.02	4.00	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	619/1172	4.20	4.42	4.15	4.25	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	767/1182	4.20	4.61	4.35	4.49	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	522/1170	4.60	4.67	4.38	4.51	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	159/ 800	4.60	4.29	4.06	4.19	4.60

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 439 01
 Title Observation & Assessme
 Instructor: Small,Sue E
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 524
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	5	15	4.19	936/1447	4.19	4.35	4.31	4.43	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	4	5	7	8	3.58	1297/1447	3.58	4.30	4.27	4.31	3.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	21	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/1241	****	4.66	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	6	16	4.30	725/1402	4.30	4.38	4.24	4.34	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	5	18	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	6	17	4.50	392/1316	4.50	4.37	4.14	4.27	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	2	5	6	10	3.59	1231/1427	3.59	4.33	4.19	4.20	3.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	538/1447	4.89	4.79	4.69	4.72	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	1	10	10	1	3.29	1302/1434	3.29	4.14	4.10	4.17	3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	3	2	2	6	8	3.67	1282/1387	3.67	4.47	4.46	4.48	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	2	3	17	4.57	1090/1387	4.57	4.81	4.73	4.76	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	5	0	6	5	5	3.24	1302/1386	3.24	4.40	4.32	4.34	3.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	3	2	9	6	3.64	1208/1380	3.64	4.34	4.32	4.34	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	7	3	3	4	2	3	2.93	1108/1193	2.93	4.06	4.02	4.00	2.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	4	0	2	8	5	3.53	990/1172	3.53	4.42	4.15	4.25	3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	638/1182	4.40	4.61	4.35	4.49	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	687/1170	4.37	4.67	4.38	4.51	4.37
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	345/ 800	4.24	4.29	4.06	4.19	4.24
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	20/ 38	4.69	4.55	4.49	4.68	4.69
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	24/ 36	4.00	4.19	4.25	4.42	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	17/ 28	4.54	4.68	4.52	4.72	4.54
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	2	0	3	8	4.31	18/ 30	4.31	4.39	4.30	4.38	4.31
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	2	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	20/ 27	4.27	4.45	4.43	4.62	4.27

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors				

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	23	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	8	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	27
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 441 01
 Title Materials For Early Li
 Instructor: Scully,Patricia
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 525
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	158/1447	4.89	4.35	4.31	4.43	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	128/1447	4.89	4.30	4.27	4.31	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	23	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1241	****	4.66	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	186/1402	4.79	4.38	4.24	4.34	4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	20	4.64	251/1358	4.64	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	150/1316	4.78	4.37	4.14	4.27	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	22	4.75	200/1427	4.75	4.33	4.19	4.20	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	6	20	4.63	262/1434	4.63	4.14	4.10	4.17	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	3	20	4.72	490/1387	4.72	4.47	4.46	4.48	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.81	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	206/1386	4.84	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	227/1380	4.84	4.34	4.32	4.34	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	433/1193	4.31	4.06	4.02	4.00	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	146/1172	4.86	4.42	4.15	4.25	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	3	1	18	4.68	410/1182	4.68	4.61	4.35	4.49	4.68
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	264/1170	4.86	4.67	4.38	4.51	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	169/ 800	4.57	4.29	4.06	4.19	4.57
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.67	4.34	4.61	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.74	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.56	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.52	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 64	****	4.35	4.09	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	17/ 38	4.83	4.55	4.49	4.68	4.83
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	4.19	4.25	4.42	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	4.68	4.52	4.72	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.38	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	12/ 27	4.82	4.45	4.43	4.62	4.82
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.72	4.80	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.64	4.60	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: EDUC 441 01
 Title Materials For Early Li
 Instructor: Scully, Patricia
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 525
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	25	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	7	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	28
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 442 01
 Title Process Sem ECE - Medi
 Instructor: Costello, Margar
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 526
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	4	6	13	4.16	954/1447	4.16	4.35	4.31	4.43	4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	3	5	14	4.20	911/1447	4.20	4.30	4.27	4.31	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	17	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	541/1241	4.50	4.66	4.33	4.41	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	0	2	5	14	4.41	616/1402	4.41	4.38	4.24	4.34	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	1	2	2	3	11	4.11	746/1358	4.11	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	1	6	11	4.37	527/1316	4.37	4.37	4.14	4.27	4.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	3	5	13	4.04	948/1427	4.04	4.33	4.19	4.20	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	5	13	3	3.82	1045/1434	3.82	4.14	4.10	4.17	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	2	3	4	9	3.95	1207/1387	3.95	4.47	4.46	4.48	3.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	317/1387	4.95	4.81	4.73	4.76	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	2	2	6	10	4.20	927/1386	4.20	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	1	4	13	4.35	799/1380	4.35	4.34	4.32	4.34	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	11	1	2	1	0	5	3.67	895/1193	3.67	4.06	4.02	4.00	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	521/1172	4.33	4.42	4.15	4.25	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	347/1182	4.75	4.61	4.35	4.49	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	576/1170	4.50	4.67	4.38	4.51	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	408/ 800	4.09	4.29	4.06	4.19	4.09
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 38	****	4.55	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 36	****	4.19	4.25	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.68	4.52	4.72	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.39	4.30	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 27	****	4.45	4.43	4.62	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 22	Required for Majors	22
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1	Graduate	7
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	19
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	Other	0
			I 0		
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 447 01
 Title Tchng Rdg & Writing EC
 Instructor: Scully, Patricia
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 527
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	118/1447	4.92	4.35	4.31	4.43	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	162/1447	4.85	4.30	4.27	4.31	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	74/1402	4.92	4.38	4.24	4.34	4.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	387/1358	4.46	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	512/1316	4.38	4.37	4.14	4.27	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	69/1427	4.92	4.33	4.19	4.20	4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.14	4.10	4.17	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	180/1387	4.92	4.47	4.46	4.48	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.81	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	122/1386	4.92	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	339/1380	4.75	4.34	4.32	4.34	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	332/1193	4.45	4.06	4.02	4.00	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	247/1172	4.71	4.42	4.15	4.25	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	382/1182	4.71	4.61	4.35	4.49	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	275/1170	4.86	4.67	4.38	4.51	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	290/ 800	4.33	4.29	4.06	4.19	4.33
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.55	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 36	****	4.19	4.25	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.68	4.52	4.72	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	4.39	4.30	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.45	4.43	4.62	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	6	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	1138/1447	3.93	4.35	4.31	4.43	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	956/1447	4.14	4.30	4.27	4.31	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1241	****	4.66	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	745/1402	4.27	4.38	4.24	4.34	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	0	2	3	3	3.08	1283/1358	3.08	4.17	4.11	4.15	3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	5	6	4.15	710/1316	4.15	4.37	4.14	4.27	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	2	5	3.85	1117/1427	3.85	4.33	4.19	4.20	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	1168/1447	4.38	4.79	4.69	4.72	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	491/1434	4.38	4.14	4.10	4.17	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	626/1387	4.63	4.47	4.46	4.48	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.81	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	659/1380	4.50	4.34	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	652/1193	4.00	4.06	4.02	4.00	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	710/1172	4.00	4.42	4.15	4.25	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	621/1182	4.43	4.61	4.35	4.49	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	440/1170	4.71	4.67	4.38	4.51	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.29	4.06	4.19	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	47/ 66	4.50	4.74	4.58	4.87	4.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	45/ 62	4.50	4.56	4.56	4.80	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	51/ 58	3.75	4.52	4.41	4.59	3.75
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	60/ 65	3.50	4.50	4.42	4.55	3.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	44/ 64	3.75	4.35	4.09	4.43	3.75
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 38	****	4.55	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 36	****	4.19	4.25	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 28	****	4.68	4.52	4.72	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.39	4.30	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 27	****	4.45	4.43	4.62	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 2	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies									Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank							
General																
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	810/1447	4.32	4.35	4.31	4.43	4.32		
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	9	6	4.00	1053/1447	4.00	4.30	4.27	4.31	4.00		
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1241	****	4.66	4.33	4.41	****		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	2	2	1	9	4.00	976/1402	4.00	4.38	4.24	4.34	4.00		
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	430/1358	4.43	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.43		
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	5	2	8	4.00	812/1316	4.00	4.37	4.14	4.27	4.00		
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	2	2	10	3.74	1172/1427	3.74	4.33	4.19	4.20	3.74		
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	786/1447	4.79	4.79	4.69	4.72	4.79		
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	2	2	8	3	3.80	1052/1434	3.80	4.14	4.10	4.17	3.80		
Lecture																
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	1153/1387	4.08	4.47	4.46	4.48	4.08		
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	681/1387	4.85	4.81	4.73	4.76	4.85		
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	962/1386	4.15	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.15		
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	2	3	1	6	3.69	1188/1380	3.69	4.34	4.32	4.34	3.69		
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	652/1193	4.00	4.06	4.02	4.00	4.00		
Discussion																
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	607/1172	4.21	4.42	4.15	4.25	4.21		
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	450/1182	4.64	4.61	4.35	4.49	4.64		
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	0	11	4.57	538/1170	4.57	4.67	4.38	4.51	4.57		
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	371/ 800	4.18	4.29	4.06	4.19	4.18		
Seminar																
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	35/ 66	4.75	4.74	4.58	4.87	4.75		
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	54/ 62	3.88	4.56	4.56	4.80	3.88		
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	2	0	1	5	4.13	46/ 58	4.13	4.52	4.41	4.59	4.13		
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	50/ 65	4.13	4.50	4.42	4.55	4.13		
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	49/ 64	3.57	4.35	4.09	4.43	3.57		
Field Work																
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	15/ 38	4.88	4.55	4.49	4.68	4.88		
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	22/ 36	4.13	4.19	4.25	4.42	4.13		
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	25/ 28	4.13	4.68	4.52	4.72	4.13		
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	19/ 30	4.25	4.39	4.30	4.38	4.25		
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	18/ 27	4.43	4.45	4.43	4.62	4.43		

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 18	Required for Majors 18
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 1	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 16
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	11	F 0	Non-major 19
				P 0	
				I 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				? 0	Other 0

Course-Section: EDUC 601 01
 Title Human Learning/Cogniti
 Instructor: Filbert, Teresa
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 530
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	654/1447	4.45	4.35	4.31	4.46	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	281/1447	4.73	4.30	4.27	4.30	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	282/1241	4.75	4.66	4.33	4.38	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	249/1402	4.73	4.38	4.24	4.29	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	319/1358	4.55	4.17	4.11	4.26	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	188/1316	4.73	4.37	4.14	4.34	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	310/1427	4.64	4.33	4.19	4.25	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	1079/1447	4.50	4.79	4.69	4.74	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	491/1434	4.38	4.14	4.10	4.21	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.47	4.46	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.81	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	159/1380	4.91	4.34	4.32	4.38	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	205/1193	4.64	4.06	4.02	4.02	4.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	124/1172	4.90	4.42	4.15	4.32	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.61	4.35	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.67	4.38	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.29	4.06	4.10	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	31/ 38	4.22	4.55	4.49	4.77	4.22
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	29/ 36	3.88	4.19	4.25	4.39	3.88
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	2	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	4.68	4.52	4.83	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	21/ 30	4.13	4.39	4.30	4.66	4.13
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	4	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	21/ 27	4.25	4.45	4.43	4.71	4.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	6	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 1						

Course-Section: EDUC 602 03
 Title Instructional Sys Dev
 Instructor: Hodell, Charles
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 531
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	254/1447	4.80	4.35	4.31	4.46	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	196/1447	4.80	4.30	4.27	4.30	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.66	4.33	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	165/1402	4.80	4.38	4.24	4.29	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	137/1358	4.80	4.17	4.11	4.26	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	76/1316	4.90	4.37	4.14	4.34	4.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	256/1427	4.70	4.33	4.19	4.25	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	485/1447	4.90	4.79	4.69	4.74	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	278/1434	4.60	4.14	4.10	4.21	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	353/1387	4.80	4.47	4.46	4.51	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.81	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	607/1386	4.50	4.40	4.32	4.43	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	273/1380	4.80	4.34	4.32	4.38	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	652/1193	4.00	4.06	4.02	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	181/1172	4.80	4.42	4.15	4.32	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	490/1182	4.60	4.61	4.35	4.46	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	459/1170	4.70	4.67	4.38	4.52	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	366/ 800	4.20	4.29	4.06	4.10	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 8	A 7	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 3 Major 8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 7 Non-major 2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	474/1447	4.60	4.35	4.31	4.46	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	315/1447	4.70	4.30	4.27	4.30	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.66	4.33	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	281/1402	4.70	4.38	4.24	4.29	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	563/1358	4.30	4.17	4.11	4.26	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.37	4.14	4.34	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	154/1427	4.80	4.33	4.19	4.25	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	485/1447	4.90	4.79	4.69	4.74	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	634/1434	4.25	4.14	4.10	4.21	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	230/1387	4.89	4.47	4.46	4.51	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.81	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	290/1386	4.78	4.40	4.32	4.43	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	312/1380	4.78	4.34	4.32	4.38	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	186/1193	4.67	4.06	4.02	4.02	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	546/1172	4.30	4.42	4.15	4.32	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	400/1182	4.70	4.61	4.35	4.46	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	459/1170	4.70	4.67	4.38	4.52	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	159/ 800	4.60	4.29	4.06	4.10	4.60
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.67	4.34	4.79	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.74	4.58	4.71	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.52	4.41	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	4.35	4.09	4.18	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.55	4.49	4.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.19	4.25	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 8	Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 3	Non-major 5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: EDUC 625 01
 Title Teach Read Writ ELS I
 Instructor: Shin,Sarah J
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 533
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	529/1447	4.56	4.35	4.31	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	352/1447	4.67	4.30	4.27	4.30	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	168/1241	4.88	4.66	4.33	4.38	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	567/1402	4.44	4.38	4.24	4.29	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	409/1358	4.44	4.17	4.11	4.26	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	239/1316	4.67	4.37	4.14	4.34	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	283/1427	4.67	4.33	4.19	4.25	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	998/1447	4.63	4.79	4.69	4.74	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	309/1434	4.56	4.14	4.10	4.21	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.47	4.46	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	579/1387	4.89	4.81	4.73	4.81	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	159/1386	4.89	4.40	4.32	4.43	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	312/1380	4.78	4.34	4.32	4.38	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	131/1193	4.75	4.06	4.02	4.02	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	135/1172	4.89	4.42	4.15	4.32	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.61	4.35	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.67	4.38	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	290/ 800	4.33	4.29	4.06	4.10	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 3	Major 8	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 2				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 6	Non-major 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0				
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	0		
				? 2				

Course-Section: EDUC 644 01
 Title Ling/Esol Educators
 Instructor: Shin,Sarah J
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 534
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.35	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.30	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	282/1241	4.75	4.66	4.33	4.38	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	603/1402	4.42	4.38	4.24	4.29	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.17	4.11	4.26	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	239/1316	4.67	4.37	4.14	4.34	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	133/1427	4.83	4.33	4.19	4.25	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	3	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	102/1434	4.86	4.14	4.10	4.21	4.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.47	4.46	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.81	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	217/1386	4.83	4.40	4.32	4.43	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.34	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	131/1193	4.75	4.06	4.02	4.02	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	282/1172	4.67	4.42	4.15	4.32	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	0	2	8	4.33	691/1182	4.33	4.61	4.35	4.46	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	390/1170	4.75	4.67	4.38	4.52	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	0	2	1	8	4.25	335/ 800	4.25	4.29	4.06	4.10	4.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	2	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	1
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: EDUC 648 01
 Title Consulting
 Instructor: Buelow,John W.
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 535
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	179/1447	4.88	4.35	4.31	4.46	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	249/1447	4.75	4.30	4.27	4.30	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.66	4.33	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	217/1402	4.75	4.38	4.24	4.29	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.17	4.11	4.26	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	166/1316	4.75	4.37	4.14	4.34	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	459/1427	4.50	4.33	4.19	4.25	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1036/1447	4.57	4.79	4.69	4.74	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	278/1434	4.60	4.14	4.10	4.21	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.47	4.46	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.81	4.73	4.81	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.43	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.34	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	100/1193	4.80	4.06	4.02	4.02	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.42	4.15	4.32	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.61	4.35	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.67	4.38	4.52	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	239/ 800	4.43	4.29	4.06	4.10	4.43	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors		3	Graduate	7	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0							
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives		5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: EDUC 650 01
 Title Educ In Cultural Persp
 Instructor: Young,Patricia
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 536
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	287/1447	4.77	4.35	4.31	4.46	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	327/1447	4.68	4.30	4.27	4.30	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	334/1241	4.71	4.66	4.33	4.38	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	347/1402	4.64	4.38	4.24	4.29	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	14	4.41	452/1358	4.41	4.17	4.11	4.26	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	196/1316	4.71	4.37	4.14	4.34	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	191/1427	4.76	4.33	4.19	4.25	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	243/1447	4.95	4.79	4.69	4.74	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	442/1434	4.41	4.14	4.10	4.21	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	1	19	4.73	475/1387	4.73	4.47	4.46	4.51	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	19	4.77	829/1387	4.77	4.81	4.73	4.81	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	2	16	4.50	607/1386	4.50	4.40	4.32	4.43	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	3	16	4.50	659/1380	4.50	4.34	4.32	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	2	3	15	4.48	314/1193	4.48	4.06	4.02	4.02	4.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	181/1172	4.80	4.42	4.15	4.32	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	440/1182	4.65	4.61	4.35	4.46	4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	390/1170	4.75	4.67	4.38	4.52	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	279/ 800	4.35	4.29	4.06	4.10	4.35
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.67	4.34	4.79	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.67	4.48	4.73	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 66	****	4.74	4.58	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 62	****	4.56	4.56	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.52	4.41	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 64	****	4.35	4.09	4.18	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.55	4.49	4.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.19	4.25	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.68	4.52	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	4.39	4.30	4.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 27	****	4.45	4.43	4.71	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.72	4.85	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.57	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.64	4.59	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	4.56	****

Course-Section: EDUC 650 01
 Title Educ In Cultural Persp
 Instructor: Young,Patricia
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 536
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	17	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	7	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 655 01
 Title Tch Read Writ ELS II
 Instructor: Crandall,Joann
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 537
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	74/1447	4.95	4.35	4.31	4.46	4.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	352/1447	4.67	4.30	4.27	4.30	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	599/1241	4.45	4.66	4.33	4.38	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	259/1402	4.71	4.38	4.24	4.29	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	52/1358	4.95	4.17	4.11	4.26	4.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	128/1316	4.80	4.37	4.14	4.34	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	120/1427	4.85	4.33	4.19	4.25	4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	485/1447	4.90	4.79	4.69	4.74	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	105/1434	4.84	4.14	4.10	4.21	4.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	200/1387	4.90	4.47	4.46	4.51	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.81	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	366/1386	4.71	4.40	4.32	4.43	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	216/1380	4.85	4.34	4.32	4.38	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	186/1193	4.67	4.06	4.02	4.02	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	289/1172	4.65	4.42	4.15	4.32	4.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	521/1182	4.55	4.61	4.35	4.46	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	223/1170	4.90	4.67	4.38	4.52	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	90/ 800	4.80	4.29	4.06	4.10	4.80
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.74	4.58	4.71	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors		19	Graduate	15	Major	19
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0							
Grad.	15	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives		2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	222/1447	4.83	4.35	4.31	4.46	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	137/1447	4.88	4.30	4.27	4.30	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	186/1241	4.86	4.66	4.33	4.38	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	114/1402	4.88	4.38	4.24	4.29	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	2	2	6	9	4.16	700/1358	4.16	4.17	4.11	4.26	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	117/1316	4.83	4.37	4.14	4.34	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	86/1427	4.91	4.33	4.19	4.25	4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	436/1447	4.91	4.79	4.69	4.74	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	133/1434	4.79	4.14	4.10	4.21	4.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	100/1387	4.96	4.47	4.46	4.51	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.81	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	217/1386	4.83	4.40	4.32	4.43	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	286/1380	4.79	4.34	4.32	4.38	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	2	1	1	4	5	3.69	879/1193	3.69	4.06	4.02	4.02	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	240/1172	4.73	4.42	4.15	4.32	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	240/1182	4.86	4.61	4.35	4.46	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	364/1170	4.77	4.67	4.38	4.52	4.77
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	5	2	10	4.29	313/ 800	4.29	4.29	4.06	4.10	4.29
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	4.67	4.34	4.82	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.67	4.34	4.79	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.67	4.48	4.73	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	4.67	4.33	4.67	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.55	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.74	4.58	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.56	4.56	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.52	4.41	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	4.35	4.09	4.18	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.55	4.49	4.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.19	4.25	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.68	4.52	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.39	4.30	4.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.45	4.43	4.71	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.72	4.85	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.57	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.64	4.59	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	4.56	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	4.80	****

Course-Section: EDUC 667 01
 Title Grammar For Amer Engl
 Instructor: Nelson,John E
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 538
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	13	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	13	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	562/1447	4.53	4.35	4.31	4.46	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	376/1447	4.65	4.30	4.27	4.30	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	717/1241	4.33	4.66	4.33	4.38	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	402/1402	4.59	4.38	4.24	4.29	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	8	7	4.06	772/1358	4.06	4.17	4.11	4.26	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	312/1316	4.59	4.37	4.14	4.34	4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	99/1427	4.88	4.33	4.19	4.25	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	291/1447	4.94	4.79	4.69	4.74	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	14	2	4.13	775/1434	4.13	4.14	4.10	4.21	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	698/1387	4.57	4.47	4.46	4.51	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	656/1387	4.86	4.81	4.73	4.81	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	457/1386	4.64	4.40	4.32	4.43	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	491/1380	4.64	4.34	4.32	4.38	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	155/1193	4.71	4.06	4.02	4.02	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	333/1172	4.59	4.42	4.15	4.32	4.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	282/1182	4.82	4.61	4.35	4.46	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	243/1170	4.88	4.67	4.38	4.52	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	166/ 800	4.59	4.29	4.06	4.10	4.59
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 66	****	4.74	4.58	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 62	****	4.56	4.56	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.52	4.41	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 64	****	4.35	4.09	4.18	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2	Graduate	10
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	Under-grad	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0	Major	6
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	F 0	Non-major	11
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0		
			? 0		
			Other		0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	529/1447	4.56	4.35	4.31	4.46	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	619/1447	4.44	4.30	4.27	4.30	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	380/1241	4.67	4.66	4.33	4.38	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	766/1402	4.25	4.38	4.24	4.29	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.17	4.11	4.26	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1101/1316	3.57	4.37	4.14	4.34	3.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	283/1427	4.67	4.33	4.19	4.25	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	958/1447	4.67	4.79	4.69	4.74	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	849/1434	3.75	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	1063/1387	3.94	4.47	4.46	4.51	3.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	829/1387	4.22	4.81	4.73	4.81	4.22	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	811/1386	4.00	4.40	4.32	4.43	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	915/1380	3.94	4.34	4.32	4.38	3.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	186/1193	4.33	4.06	4.02	4.02	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	0	3	4	4.00	710/1172	4.00	4.42	4.15	4.32	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	824/1182	4.11	4.61	4.35	4.46	4.11	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	781/1170	4.22	4.67	4.38	4.52	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	612/ 800	3.67	4.29	4.06	4.10	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	58/ 189	4.67	4.67	4.34	4.82	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	59/ 192	4.67	4.67	4.34	4.79	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	71/ 186	4.67	4.67	4.48	4.73	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	73/ 187	4.67	4.67	4.33	4.67	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.55	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 66	****	4.74	4.58	4.71	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 62	****	4.56	4.56	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	4.52	4.41	4.75	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.64	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 64	****	4.35	4.09	4.18	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	4.55	4.49	4.77	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 36	****	4.19	4.25	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.68	4.52	4.83	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	4.39	4.30	4.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 27	****	4.45	4.43	4.71	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.72	4.85	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.57	4.65	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.64	4.59	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	4.56	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	4.80	****	

Course-Section: EDUC 681 01
 Title Surv Of Instr Tech App
 Instructor: Kellerman,Paul (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 540
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	529/1447	4.56	4.35	4.31	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	619/1447	4.44	4.30	4.27	4.30	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	380/1241	4.67	4.66	4.33	4.38	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	766/1402	4.25	4.38	4.24	4.29	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.17	4.11	4.26	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1101/1316	3.57	4.37	4.14	4.34	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	283/1427	4.67	4.33	4.19	4.25	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	958/1447	4.67	4.79	4.69	4.74	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1238/1434	3.75	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1282/1387	3.94	4.47	4.46	4.51	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1353/1387	4.22	4.81	4.73	4.81	4.22
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1220/1386	4.00	4.40	4.32	4.43	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1198/1380	3.94	4.34	4.32	4.38	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	652/1193	4.33	4.06	4.02	4.02	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	0	3	4	4.00	710/1172	4.00	4.42	4.15	4.32	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	824/1182	4.11	4.61	4.35	4.46	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	781/1170	4.22	4.67	4.38	4.52	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	612/ 800	3.67	4.29	4.06	4.10	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	58/ 189	4.67	4.67	4.34	4.82	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	59/ 192	4.67	4.67	4.34	4.79	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	71/ 186	4.67	4.67	4.48	4.73	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	73/ 187	4.67	4.67	4.33	4.67	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.55	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 66	****	4.74	4.58	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 62	****	4.56	4.56	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	4.52	4.41	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 64	****	4.35	4.09	4.18	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	4.55	4.49	4.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 36	****	4.19	4.25	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.68	4.52	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	4.39	4.30	4.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 27	****	4.45	4.43	4.71	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.72	4.85	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.57	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.64	4.59	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	4.56	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	4.80	****

Course-Section: EDUC 681 01
 Title Surv Of Instr Tech App
 Instructor: Ira, Katherine E (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 541
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	179/1447	4.88	4.35	4.31	4.46	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	532/1447	4.50	4.30	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	427/1241	4.63	4.66	4.33	4.38	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	645/1402	4.38	4.38	4.24	4.29	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.17	4.11	4.26	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	392/1316	4.50	4.37	4.14	4.34	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	632/1427	4.38	4.33	4.19	4.25	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	836/1447	4.75	4.79	4.69	4.74	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	733/1434	4.17	4.14	4.10	4.21	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	429/1387	4.75	4.47	4.46	4.51	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.81	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	775/1386	4.38	4.40	4.32	4.43	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	520/1380	4.63	4.34	4.32	4.38	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	960/1193	3.50	4.06	4.02	4.02	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	377/1172	4.50	4.42	4.15	4.32	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	470/1182	4.63	4.61	4.35	4.46	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	576/1170	4.50	4.67	4.38	4.52	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	114/ 800	4.71	4.29	4.06	4.10	4.71
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.74	4.58	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.56	4.56	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.52	4.41	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	4.35	4.09	4.18	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	23/ 38	4.50	4.55	4.49	4.77	4.50
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	24/ 36	4.00	4.19	4.25	4.39	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.68	4.52	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	10/ 30	4.50	4.39	4.30	4.66	4.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	4.45	4.43	4.71	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 710 01
 Title Cult & Design Info. Co
 Instructor: Young,Patricia
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 543
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	927/1447	4.20	4.35	4.31	4.46	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1323/1447	3.50	4.30	4.27	4.30	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	685/1402	4.33	4.38	4.24	4.29	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1170/1358	3.50	4.17	4.11	4.26	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	549/1316	4.33	4.37	4.14	4.34	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	2	2	3.67	1201/1427	3.67	4.33	4.19	4.25	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1293/1434	3.33	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1304/1387	3.50	4.47	4.46	4.51	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	707/1387	4.83	4.81	4.73	4.81	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	4	0	3.50	1258/1386	3.50	4.40	4.32	4.43	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	0	2	3.67	1198/1380	3.67	4.34	4.32	4.38	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	288/1193	4.50	4.06	4.02	4.02	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	710/1172	4.00	4.42	4.15	4.32	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	430/1182	4.67	4.61	4.35	4.46	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	480/1170	4.67	4.67	4.38	4.52	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	789/ 800	2.20	4.29	4.06	4.10	2.20
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	4.74	4.58	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	****	4.56	4.56	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.52	4.41	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	4.35	4.09	4.18	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.72	4.85	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.64	4.59	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	4	7	1	7	3.33	1369/1447	3.33	4.35	4.31	4.46	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	7	5	4	1	2.57	1427/1447	2.57	4.30	4.27	4.30	2.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/1241	****	4.66	4.33	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	7	5	5	3.55	1245/1402	3.55	4.38	4.24	4.29	3.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	5	3	3	7	3.40	1212/1358	3.40	4.17	4.11	4.26	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	4	5	6	4	3.53	1124/1316	3.53	4.37	4.14	4.34	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	4	3	5	5	3.25	1331/1427	3.25	4.33	4.19	4.25	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	511/1447	4.89	4.79	4.69	4.74	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	7	6	4	1	2.94	1368/1434	2.94	4.14	4.10	4.21	2.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	7	6	2	4	3.05	1347/1387	3.05	4.47	4.46	4.51	3.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	528/1387	4.90	4.81	4.73	4.81	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	8	6	3	0	2.45	1370/1386	2.45	4.40	4.32	4.43	2.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	5	5	3	2	2.60	1351/1380	2.60	4.34	4.32	4.38	2.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	7	2	5	3	2	2.53	1155/1193	2.53	4.06	4.02	4.02	2.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	9	5	2	3.14	1076/1172	3.14	4.42	4.15	4.32	3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	5	3	5	8	3.76	1008/1182	3.76	4.61	4.35	4.46	3.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	2	4	7	7	3.81	976/1170	3.81	4.67	4.38	4.52	3.81
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	1	7	6	4	3.72	592/ 800	3.72	4.29	4.06	4.10	3.72
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 189	****	4.67	4.34	4.82	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 192	****	4.67	4.34	4.79	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 186	****	4.67	4.48	4.73	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 187	****	4.67	4.33	4.67	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.55	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 66	****	4.74	4.58	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 62	****	4.56	4.56	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	4.52	4.41	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 64	****	4.35	4.09	4.18	****
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	4.19	4.25	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.68	4.52	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	4.39	4.30	4.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 27	****	4.45	4.43	4.71	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.72	4.85	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.57	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.64	4.59	****

Course-Section: EDUC 771 3
 Title Research Designs In Ed
 Instructor: Pechman, Ellen M
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 544
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	17	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	11	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 781 1
 Title Teacher Leadership
 Instructor: Espinosa, Laura
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 545
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	529/1447	4.78	4.35	4.31	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	128/1447	4.94	4.30	4.27	4.30	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1241	****	4.66	4.33	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	143/1402	4.92	4.38	4.24	4.29	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	10	7	4.33	529/1358	4.33	4.17	4.11	4.26	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	283/1316	4.81	4.37	4.14	4.34	4.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	541/1427	4.72	4.33	4.19	4.25	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	4.44	1124/1447	4.22	4.79	4.69	4.74	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	278/1434	4.30	4.14	4.10	4.21	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	230/1387	4.94	4.47	4.46	4.51	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.81	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	82/1386	4.97	4.40	4.32	4.43	4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	181/1380	4.94	4.34	4.32	4.38	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	288/1193	4.75	4.06	4.02	4.02	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	135/1172	4.94	4.42	4.15	4.32	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	119/1182	4.97	4.61	4.35	4.46	4.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	134/1170	4.97	4.67	4.38	4.52	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	117/ 800	4.85	4.29	4.06	4.10	4.71
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	1	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	27/ 66	4.87	4.74	4.58	4.71	4.87
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	17/ 62	4.93	4.56	4.56	4.69	4.93
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	21/ 58	4.80	4.52	4.41	4.75	4.80
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	12/ 65	4.93	4.50	4.42	4.64	4.93
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	14/ 64	4.80	4.35	4.09	4.18	4.80

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	18	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	0	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	18	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 781 2
 Title Teacher Leadership
 Instructor: Espinosa,Laura
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 546
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.78	4.35	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.94	4.30	4.27	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.92	4.38	4.24	4.29	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	4.81	4.37	4.14	4.34	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.72	4.33	4.19	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.22	4.79	4.69	4.74	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	849/1434	4.30	4.14	4.10	4.21	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	4.94	4.47	4.46	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.81	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.97	4.40	4.32	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	4.94	4.34	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	4.75	4.06	4.02	4.02	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	4.94	4.42	4.15	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	4.97	4.61	4.35	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	4.97	4.67	4.38	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	4.85	4.29	4.06	4.10	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	0	6	7	3.94	1128/1447	4.47	4.35	4.31	4.46	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	7	8	4.31	792/1447	4.41	4.30	4.27	4.30	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	380/1241	4.71	4.66	4.33	4.38	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	6	8	4.25	766/1402	4.54	4.38	4.24	4.29	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	2	11	4.31	551/1358	4.57	4.17	4.11	4.26	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	738/1316	4.48	4.37	4.14	4.34	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	763/1427	4.55	4.33	4.19	4.25	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	339/1447	4.80	4.79	4.69	4.74	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	0	3	3	5	3.69	1131/1434	4.15	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1317/1387	4.20	4.47	4.46	4.51	3.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	1282/1387	4.60	4.81	4.73	4.81	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1283/1386	4.12	4.40	4.32	4.43	3.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1270/1380	4.20	4.34	4.32	4.38	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1041/1193	3.88	4.06	4.02	4.02	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	3	9	4.20	619/1172	4.52	4.42	4.15	4.32	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	2	11	4.47	587/1182	4.65	4.61	4.35	4.46	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	559/1170	4.68	4.67	4.38	4.52	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	411/ 800	3.95	4.29	4.06	4.10	4.07
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	55/ 66	4.33	4.74	4.58	4.71	4.33
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	1	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	54/ 62	3.91	4.56	4.56	4.69	3.91
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	49/ 58	3.82	4.52	4.41	4.75	3.82
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	49/ 65	4.17	4.50	4.42	4.64	4.17
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	1	1	1	0	9	4.25	30/ 64	4.25	4.35	4.09	4.18	4.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 13	Required for Majors	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2	Graduate	9
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	7
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

Course-Section: EDUC 791 01
 Title Prac In Ed Tesol K-12
 Instructor: Wilson, Margaret
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 548
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1447	4.47	4.35	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	532/1447	4.41	4.30	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1241	4.71	4.66	4.33	4.38	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	143/1402	4.54	4.38	4.24	4.29	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	122/1358	4.57	4.17	4.11	4.26	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	112/1316	4.48	4.37	4.14	4.34	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	133/1427	4.55	4.33	4.19	4.25	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	958/1447	4.80	4.79	4.69	4.74	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	278/1434	4.15	4.14	4.10	4.21	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	4.20	4.47	4.46	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	4.60	4.81	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	217/1386	4.12	4.40	4.32	4.43	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1380	4.20	4.34	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	288/1193	3.88	4.06	4.02	4.02	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	163/1172	4.52	4.42	4.15	4.32	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	271/1182	4.65	4.61	4.35	4.46	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	295/1170	4.68	4.67	4.38	4.52	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	547/ 800	3.95	4.29	4.06	4.10	3.83

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 4	Major 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General		
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		Under-grad 2	Non-major 1
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives		
				P 0			
				I 0	Other		
				? 1			

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	4.37	4.35	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	4.52	4.30	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	4.90	4.66	4.33	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1402	4.46	4.38	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1358	4.42	4.17	4.11	4.26	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	166/1316	4.49	4.37	4.14	4.34	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1427	4.54	4.33	4.19	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	4.76	4.79	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	158/1434	4.35	4.14	4.10	4.21	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	4.58	4.47	4.46	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	4.77	4.81	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	4.73	4.40	4.32	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1030/1380	4.14	4.34	4.32	4.38	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	4.10	4.06	4.02	4.02	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1172	4.61	4.42	4.15	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1182	4.53	4.61	4.35	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1170	4.67	4.67	4.38	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	4.26	4.29	4.06	4.10	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 66	4.90	4.74	4.58	4.71	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 62	4.83	4.56	4.56	4.69	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 58	4.92	4.52	4.41	4.75	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 65	4.92	4.50	4.42	4.64	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 64	4.80	4.35	4.09	4.18	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	4.55	4.49	4.77	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	4.19	4.25	4.39	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	4.68	4.52	4.83	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.66	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 27	5.00	4.45	4.43	4.71	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	4.75	4.75	4.72	4.85	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 21	4.50	4.50	4.57	4.65	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	4.75	4.75	4.64	4.59	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 20	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.56	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 15	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.80	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: EDUC 792 1
 Title ISD Internship
 Instructor: Frick, Jerri L.
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 550
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	752/1447	4.37	4.35	4.31	4.46	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	327/1447	4.52	4.30	4.27	4.30	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1241	4.90	4.66	4.33	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	459/1402	4.46	4.38	4.24	4.29	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	345/1358	4.42	4.17	4.11	4.26	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	196/1316	4.49	4.37	4.14	4.34	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	265/1427	4.54	4.33	4.19	4.25	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	1132/1447	4.76	4.79	4.69	4.74	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	341/1434	4.35	4.14	4.10	4.21	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	596/1387	4.58	4.47	4.46	4.51	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	784/1387	4.77	4.81	4.73	4.81	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	182/1386	4.73	4.40	4.32	4.43	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	491/1380	4.14	4.34	4.32	4.38	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	2	1	1	7	4.18	536/1193	4.10	4.06	4.02	4.02	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	232/1172	4.61	4.42	4.15	4.32	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	303/1182	4.53	4.61	4.35	4.46	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1170	4.67	4.67	4.38	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	1	1	0	0	6	4.13	398/ 800	4.26	4.29	4.06	4.10	4.13
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	30/ 66	4.90	4.74	4.58	4.71	4.80
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	41/ 62	4.83	4.56	4.56	4.69	4.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	19/ 58	4.92	4.52	4.41	4.75	4.83
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	21/ 65	4.92	4.50	4.42	4.64	4.83
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	19/ 64	4.80	4.35	4.09	4.18	4.60
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	5.00	4.55	4.49	4.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	5.00	4.19	4.25	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	5.00	4.68	4.52	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	5.00	4.45	4.43	4.71	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	4.75	4.75	4.72	4.85	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	4.75	4.75	4.64	4.59	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	9	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 792 3
 Title ISD Internship
 Instructor: Irish, Teresa J.
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 551
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	6	1	6	3.73	1265/1447	4.37	4.35	4.31	4.46	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	1	7	3.87	1168/1447	4.52	4.30	4.27	4.30	3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	231/1241	4.90	4.66	4.33	4.38	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	4	2	6	3.86	1107/1402	4.46	4.38	4.24	4.29	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1022/1358	4.42	4.17	4.11	4.26	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	812/1316	4.49	4.37	4.14	4.34	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	2	2	7	3.93	1055/1427	4.54	4.33	4.19	4.25	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	619/1447	4.76	4.79	4.69	4.74	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	6	1	3.80	1052/1434	4.35	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	1137/1387	4.58	4.47	4.46	4.51	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1143/1387	4.77	4.81	4.73	4.81	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	811/1386	4.73	4.40	4.32	4.43	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	2	1	4	3.78	1162/1380	4.14	4.34	4.32	4.38	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	2	0	3	1	2	3.13	1070/1193	4.10	4.06	4.02	4.02	3.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	4	0	5	4.11	666/1172	4.61	4.42	4.15	4.32	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	4	0	4	3.78	1005/1182	4.53	4.61	4.35	4.46	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	864/1170	4.67	4.67	4.38	4.52	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	612/ 800	4.26	4.29	4.06	4.10	3.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	4.90	4.74	4.58	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	4.83	4.56	4.56	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	4.92	4.52	4.41	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	4.92	4.50	4.42	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	4.80	4.35	4.09	4.18	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	24/ 31	4.75	4.75	4.72	4.85	4.50
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	17/ 21	4.50	4.50	4.57	4.65	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	24/ 31	4.75	4.75	4.64	4.59	4.50
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 20	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.56	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 15	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 4	Major 0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 11	Non-major 15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	12	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: EDUC 794 01
 Title ISD Project Seminar
 Instructor: Kinerney, Donna
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 552
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	375/1447	4.70	4.35	4.31	4.46	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	315/1447	4.70	4.30	4.27	4.30	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	478/1241	4.57	4.66	4.33	4.38	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	165/1402	4.80	4.38	4.24	4.29	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	1125/1358	3.60	4.17	4.11	4.26	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	572/1316	4.30	4.37	4.14	4.34	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	154/1427	4.80	4.33	4.19	4.25	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	754/1447	4.80	4.79	4.69	4.74	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	849/1434	4.00	4.14	4.10	4.21	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	798/1387	4.50	4.47	4.46	4.51	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	982/1387	4.67	4.81	4.73	4.81	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	253/1386	4.80	4.40	4.32	4.43	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	659/1380	4.50	4.34	4.32	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	2	0	1	1	2.80	1130/1193	2.80	4.06	4.02	4.02	2.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	710/1172	4.00	4.42	4.15	4.32	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1127/1182	3.20	4.61	4.35	4.46	3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	798/1170	4.20	4.67	4.38	4.52	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	2	1	1	1	0	2.20	789/ 800	2.20	4.29	4.06	4.10	2.20
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	41/ 66	4.67	4.74	4.58	4.71	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	43/ 62	4.57	4.56	4.56	4.69	4.57
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	19/ 58	4.83	4.52	4.41	4.75	4.83
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	42/ 65	4.43	4.50	4.42	4.64	4.43
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	29/ 64	4.29	4.35	4.09	4.18	4.29

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 795 1
 Title Sem Study Teaching
 Instructor: Smith,Murdux
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 553
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	4	7	8	1	3.19	1390/1447	3.19	4.35	4.31	4.46	3.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	6	6	6	3.80	1210/1447	3.80	4.30	4.27	4.30	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1241	****	4.66	4.33	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	10	7	3	3.57	1238/1402	3.57	4.38	4.24	4.29	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	8	6	3	3.33	1231/1358	3.33	4.17	4.11	4.26	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	9	8	0	3.14	1243/1316	3.14	4.37	4.14	4.34	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	6	3	11	4.14	882/1427	4.14	4.33	4.19	4.25	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	485/1447	4.90	4.79	4.69	4.74	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	11	0	3.79	1066/1434	3.79	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	7	4	8	3.86	1240/1387	3.86	4.47	4.46	4.51	3.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	1125/1387	4.52	4.81	4.73	4.81	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	5	6	7	3.81	1174/1386	3.81	4.40	4.32	4.43	3.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	5	9	4	3.67	1198/1380	3.67	4.34	4.32	4.38	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	4	3	4	5	2	2.89	1119/1193	2.89	4.06	4.02	4.02	2.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	12	4	3.90	801/1172	3.90	4.42	4.15	4.32	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	4	7	9	4.14	803/1182	4.14	4.61	4.35	4.46	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	377/1170	4.76	4.67	4.38	4.52	4.76
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	0	3	2	5	4	3.71	596/ 800	3.71	4.29	4.06	4.10	3.71
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 66	****	4.74	4.58	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 62	****	4.56	4.56	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 58	****	4.52	4.41	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 64	****	4.35	4.09	4.18	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors	20
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4	Graduate	12
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0	Under-grad	9
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00 18	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	Other	0
			I 0		
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant