Course-Section: EDUC 311 01 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 509

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Title Psyc Foundation Of Edu Instructor: Williams, Vickie Spring 2010

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Credits E	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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 311 02 University of Maryland Title Psyc Foundation Of Edu

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 510

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 19 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Williams, Vickie

Instructor:

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	-	ncies	3 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
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	,	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	.,	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	,	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	,	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		13	4.65	,			4.46	4.44	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1		16	4.88		4.84	4.81	4.73	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0		1		11		,	4.56	4.40	4.32	4.30	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2		10	4.18	,	4.22	4.34	4.32	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	2	1	Τ	11	4.19	536/1193	4.13	4.06	4.02	4.05	4.19
Discussion														
	1.2	0	^	0	^	^	_	F 00	1 /1170	4 21	4 40	4 1 -	1 0 1	г оо
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13 13	0	0	0	0	0	6 5	5.00 4.83	1/1172 271/1182	4.54	4.42 4.61	4.15 4.35	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	0	1	5 5	4.83	, -				4.42	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13 13	0	0	0	1	1 1	-	4.83	295/1170 195/ 800	4.60 4.25	4.67	4.38	4.49 4.12	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	13	U	U	U	Т	Т	4	4.50	195/ 800	4.25	4.29	4.06	4.12	4.50
Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 17		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	 ajor	s 1	.3	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	1
28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 1			_			_								
56-83 4 2.00-2.99 3 C 0		Ge:	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	major	18
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 2 D 0														
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0	Electives						3	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h	
P 0								respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt		
I 0		Other						0						
? 0														

Course-Section: EDUC 313 1 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Frequencies

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean

Instructor

Rank

Page 511

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean

Title Peer Assisted Lrning I Instructor: Bichy, Cassie L Spring 2010 Enrollment: 3

Questionnaires:	3	Student C	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------------	---	-----------	--------	------------	---------------

Questions

		Genera	1															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m 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	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected 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	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	923/1241	4.00	4.66	4.33	4.33	4.00
4. Did oth	ner evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	976/1402	4.00	4.38	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute 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 wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o 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	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	971/1427	4.00	4.33	4.19	4.15	4.00
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	849/1434	4.00	4.14	4.10	4.09	4.00
		Lectur	0															
1 Wara th	o inatri	actor's lecture	_	propored	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4 00	1176/1387	4 00	4.47	1 16	4.44	4.00
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00		4.73	4.71	5.00
				xplained clearly	1	-	0	0	0	2	0		1047/1386	4.00	4.40	4.32	4.30	4.00
		es contribute t		1	-	0	0	0	2	0		1030/1380	4.00	4.34		4.32	4.00	
			our understanding	1	•	0	0	2	0	0		1087/1193					3.00	
J. DIG auc	iiovisuai	r ceciniiques en	nance y	our understanding	_	U	U	U	2	U	U	3.00	1007/1193	3.00	1.00	4.02	1.03	3.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute 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 al	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d 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	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d 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 sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.29	4.06	4.12	5.00
				Fred	uency	. Die	tribi	ıtioı	n									
				rred	uency	DIS	CIID	10101	.1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Typ	e			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	aior:	 S	0	Graduate		0	Majo	 r	0	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			1			5	-	-			-	5	_	-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-gr	ad	3	Non-	major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0								-			-		5	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				2	#### - M	leans t	here a	re not	enouc	rh
	-			P 0									response					•
				I O		Ot1	her					0			5			
				? 0														

Course-Section: EDUC 314 1 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County Peer Assisted Lrning I Spring 2010

Instructor: Bichy,Cassie L

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 512 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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		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		4.40	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		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		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		4.29	4.06	4.12	5.00
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor:	 S	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majc	 or	0

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	<u>.</u>	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	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		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	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: EDUC 388 01 University of Maryland

Title Inclusion & Instructio Baltimore County Instructor: Wilson-Craig,Es Spring 2010

Enrollment: 18

Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 513

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

						-										
			Frequencies Inst				ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
	Questions			NA	1	_		4	5		Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new in	nsights,skills fr	om 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 e	xpected 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 quest	ions reflect the	expected goals	1	12	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1241	****	4.66	4.33	4.33	***
4. Did other evaluation	ons reflect the e	xpected 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 reading	ngs 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 assign	ments 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 sys	stem clearly expl	ained	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	e the overall tea	ching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	454/1434	4.40	4.14	4.10	4.09	4.40
1. Were the instructor	r'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 materia	al 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 co	ontribute 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 te	chniques 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 discussion	ons contribute to	what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	3		3.83	841/1172	3.83	4.42	4.15	4.24	3.83
2. Were all students	actively encourag	ed 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 a	nd 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 techn	Were special techniques successful						1	3	2	4.17	380/ 800	4.17	4.29	4.06	4.12	4.17
	F															
redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 13				Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	rs 1	5	Graduat	 e	 1	Majo	or	0

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	13	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 410 01

Read Contnt Area I

Title Read Contnt Area Instructor: North-Coleman, C

Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 514 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

	-			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	2	1	4	_	11	2 06	1100/1447	2 76	4 25	1 21	1 12	2 06
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2 1	1	4	2	11 13		1108/1447 1029/1447	3.76 4.10	4.35	4.31 4.27	4.43	3.96 4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	3	4	4.57		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		4.38	4.24	4.34	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	1	3	3	10		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	,		4.37	4.14	4.27	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	3	3	11		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		700/1447		4.79	4.69	4.72	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	6	7			1137/1434			4.10	4.17	
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		4.42	4.15	4.25	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	, -		4.61		4.49	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	515/1170		4.67	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	0.0	0	•	•	•	-	_	4 00		ale ale ale ale	4 54	4 50	4 05	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	Ţ	0		****/ 66 ****/ 62	****	4.74	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22 22	0	0	0	0 1	0	1		****/ 62 ****/ 58	****	4.56 4.52	4.56	4.80 4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 65	****	4.52	4.41 4.42	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	1	0	U T	0	0		****/ 64		4.35	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	U	Τ	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 64		4.33	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		****/ 36		4.19	4.25	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 28	****	4.68	4.52	4.72	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	4.39	4.30	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 27	****	4.45	4.43	4.62	****
									,					
<u> </u>														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	21	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	7	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 410 02 University of Maryland Title Read Contnt Area I Instructor: North-Coleman,C

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires: 25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 515 JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 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 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 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 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

 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

4. Were special techniques successful

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected	d 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	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 412 01

Title Analysis Of Tchng & Lr

Instructor: Williams, Vickie

Enrollment: 32
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 516 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				_	ncies			Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	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		1278/1447		4.30	4.27	4.31	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	1	1	1	0		****/1241	4.80	4.66	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	1	4	6		1056/1402		4.38	4.24	4.34	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	5	4	2		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		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		4.61	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		****/ 62	****	4.56	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	4.52	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 36	3.40	4.19	4.25	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 28	****	4.68	4.52	4.72	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	4.39	4.30	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 21	****	4.50	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 31	****	4.75	4.64	4.60	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	5.00	****
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 1	L5	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enougl	a

I

Course-Section: EDUC 412 02

Analysis Of Tchng & Lr

Title Instructor: Singer,Jonathan

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 517 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions	4		NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		e Dept Mean			Sect Mean
		General																
-	_	ew insights, skil			0	0	0	2	1 5	4	8	4.20	927/144			4.31		4.20
		ctor make clear	_	_	0 1	0 9	1	0	0	4 1	5 4	4.80	1210/144 231/124		4.30	4.27	4.31	3.80 4.80
		uestions reflect uations reflect			0	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	685/140			4.33		4.33
		eadings contribu	_	_	0	0	1	2	0	3	9	4.13	718/135			4.11	4.15	4.13
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	476/131			4.14	4.27	4.43
		system clearly			0	0	0	3	4	4			1228/142			4.19	4.20	3.60
		was class cance	_		0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	592/144	7 4.62	4.79	4.69	4.72	4.87
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overal	l teachi	ng effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	733/143	4 3.89	4.14	4.10	4.17	4.17
		Lecture	<u>:</u>															
1. Were th	ne instru	actor's lectures	well pr	repared	1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	881/138	7 4.28	4.47	4.46	4.48	4.43
2. Did the	instruc	ctor seem intere	sted in	the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	919/138	7 4.54	4.81	4.73	4.76	4.71
		erial presented			1	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	911/138			4.32	4.34	4.21
		es contribute to	_		1	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	799/138			4.32	4.34	4.36
5. Did aud	liovisual	l techniques enh	ance you	ır understanding	1	2	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	555/119	3 4.12	4.06	4.02	4.00	4.17
		Discuss			4													
	class discussions contribute to what you learn e all students actively encouraged to participa					0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	355/117			4.15	4.25	4.55
	e all students actively encouraged to participa the instructor encourage fair and open discuss					0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	198/118			4.35	4.49	4.91
						0 2	0	0	0 1	1 2	10 6	4.91 4.56	223/117 177/ 80			4.38	4.51 4.19	4.91 4.56
4. Weie sp	e special techniques successful					۷	U	U	1	4	O	4.50	1/// 00	0 4.56	4.23	4.00	4.19	4.50
2		Laborat	-		1 /	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 19	2 ****	4 67	1 21	1 (1	++++
2. Were yo	ou provid	ied with adequat	e backgr	cound information	14	U	1	U	0	U	U	1.00	/ 19	Z	4.67	4.34	4.61	
1 513 61-		Field W			1.0	0	-	0	0	1	2	4 00	20/ 2	0 4 00	4 55	4 40	4 60	4 00
		rience contribut vunderstand you			10 10	0	1 1	0 1	0	1 1	3 2	4.00	32/ 3 31/ 3		4.55 4.19	4.49 4.25	4.68 4.42	4.00 3.40
_	_	ctor available f			10	2	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 2			4.52	4.72	****
		could you discu			10	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 3		4.39	4.30	4.38	****
	_	s help you carry	_		10	3	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 2		4.45	4.43	4.62	****
		Self P	aced															
1. Did sel	f-paced	system contribu		at you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 3	1 ****	4.75	4.72	4.80	****
	_	ions make clear		_	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 2	1 ****	4.50	4.57	5.00	***
3. Were yo	ur conta	acts with the in	structor	helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 3	1 ****	4.75	4.64	4.60	****
4. Was the	feedbac	ck/tutoring by p	roctors	helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 2	0 ****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were th	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful Were there enough proctors for all the students					0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 1	5 ****	5.00	4.61	5.00	****
	Fr						trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	asons	5			Т	уре			Majors	\$
00 27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 9																	
28-55							quire	ea I	or Ma	Jors	s I	۷	Gradua	LE	0	Majo)T	0
56-83	2	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				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		Ele	ecti	ves				0		Means			_	jh
				P 0		0+1	hor					0	respon	ses to	be sigr	nifican	ıt	

Other

0

I

0

1

Course-Section: EDUC 414 01

Adolescent Literature

Title 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

		Question	S		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
2. Did the i	instructo	r make clear	lls fror the exp	_	0	0	0	2	4	3	5 5	3.93	1245/1447 1123/1447	3.93	4.35	4.31	4.43	3.79
4. Did other	r evaluat:	ions reflect	the exp	xpected goals pected goals what you learned	1 0 0	12 0 0	0 0 1	0 1 3	1 4 4	0 6 2	0 3 4	3.79	****/1241 1148/1402 1226/1358	3.79	4.66	4.33 4.24 4.11	4.41 4.34 4.15	**** 3.79 3.36
_	en assign	nments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	0	0	2	5 5	1	6	3.79	979/1316 1284/1427	3.79	4.17 4.37 4.33	4.11 4.14 4.19	4.15 4.27 4.20	3.36 3.79 3.43
8. How many	times was	s class canc	elled	ning effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0 5	3 5	11	4.79	786/1447 1088/1434	4.79	4.79	4.69	4.72 4.17	4.79
		Lectur																
	instructo	r seem inter	ested in	n the subject	0 0 0	0 0 0	0	0	2	2	10 12	4.57	656/1387	4.86	4.47	4.46	4.48	4.57
4. Did the l	Was lecture material presented and explained clear Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understar						0 0 1	0 0 1	2 3 2	6 4 4	6 7 6	4.29 4.29 3.93	855/1386 858/1380 737/1193	4.29	4.40 4.34 4.06	4.32 4.32 4.02	4.34 4.34 4.00	4.29 4.29 3.93
		Discus										,						
2. Were all	students	what you learned d to participate	4	0	0	0	3 1	2	3 6	4.50	,	4.50	4.42 4.61	4.15	4.25	3.40 4.50		
3. Did the i 4. Were spec		d open discussion	4 4	0 1	0	0	1 1	2 6	7 2	4.60 4.11	522/1170 402/ 800		4.67 4.29	4.38 4.06	4.51 4.19	4.60 4.11		
2. Were you	provided	Labora with adequa		ground information	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 192	****	4.67	4.34	4.61	****
1. Were assi	igned top:	Semina ics relevant	_	announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.74	4.58	4.87	***
2. Was the i	instructo	r available	for ind	ividual attention what you learned	13 13	0	0	0	0	0	1 0		****/ 62 ****/ 58		4.56 4.52	4.56 4.41	4.80 4.59	****
	entations	contribute	to what	you learned	13 13	0 0	0 0	0 1	0	1 0	0 0		****/ 65 ****/ 64		4.50 4.35	4.42 4.09	4.55 4.43	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	n									
Credits Earr	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors				
00-27 28-55	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1							ed fo	or Ma	jor	s 1	1	Graduat	e	3	Majo	or	0
56-83 84-150	2	C 0 D 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	major	14		
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	9	F 0 P 0			ectiv	ves				1	#### - respons				_	h
				3 0 I 0		Oth	ner					0						

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Course-Section: EDUC 416 01 University of Maryland Page 519 Title Materials Tch Read JUN 28, 2010 Instructor: Shelton, Nancy R Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	21			
Questionnaires:	20	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fr	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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		934/1387			4.73	4.76	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	7	2	7		1137/1386		4.40	4.32	4.34	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	5	2	9		990/1380		4.34	4.32	4.34	4.12
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	1	1	2	3	6		737/1193		4.06			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		- ,		4.61	4.35	4.49	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	1	3	7		,		4.67	4.38	4.51	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	2	1	2	7		380/ 800			4.06		4.17
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	5

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d 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	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				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

					_	ncie		_		tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1. Did vou 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
	or make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	3	6	3	4		1391/1447	3.11	4.30	4.27	4.31	3.11
	stions 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
	tions 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 rea	dings 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 assi	gnments contribute to what you learned	d 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 w	as 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 gr	ade the overall teaching effectiveness	s 8	1	3	1	2	3	2	3.00	1349/1434	3.00	4.14	4.10	4.17	3.00
	Lecture					_	_	_							
	tor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	2	5	9		1137/1387			4.46	4.48	4.11
	or 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
	rial presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	5	5	4		1253/1386	3.53	4.40	4.32	4.34	3.53
	contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	4	4 7	1/		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 discus	sions 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 student	s 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 instruct	or 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 tec	hniques successful	8	0	0	2	4	2	4	3.67	612/ 800	3.67	4.29	4.06	4.19	3.67
	Laboratory														
Were you provide	d with adequate background information	ı 19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 192	****	4.67	4.34	4.61	****
	Field Work														
1. Did field experi	ence 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
	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 instruct	or 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 c	ould 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
	Fro	quency	, Dia	trih	11 + i 0	n									
	ried	1uency	, אדמ	CLID	uLIO.	11									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades	3			Re	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	;

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	8	Major	0
28-55 56-83	0 3	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0 0	B 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 P	0 0	Electives	0	#### - Means responses to		are not enough gnificant	n
				I	0	Other	0			J	
				?	1						

Course-Section: EDUC 419 01
Title Assess Reading

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	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Λ	0	0	Λ	5	7	2	3 97	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		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		****/1241	****	4.66	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	,	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	****

Credits Ea	dits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades			Reasons		Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	6	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				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

Ctudent	Course	Evaluation	Ougetionn	2 i 2 c

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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	4.31	4.43	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

Credits Ea	Credits Earned			Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	11	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	5	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: EDUC 422 01
Title Social Studies: Elem S

Social Studies: Elem S Baltimore C

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

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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														
	7	0	0	1	0	1	2	4 20	619/1172	4 20	4 40	4.15	4 25	4 20
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20 4.20	767/1182	4.20 4.20	4.42 4.61	4.15	4.25 4.49	4.20 4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	522/1170	4.20	4.61	4.38	4.49	4.20
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
1. Were special econniques successivi	,	U	J	0		U	7	1.00	132/ 000	1.00	1.40	1.00	1.10	1.00

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

Course-Section: EDUC 439 01 University of Maryland Page 524
Title Observation & Assessme Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Observation & Assessme Baltimore County Small, Sue E Spring 2010

I 0

0

?

Instructor: Small, Sue

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 27

Job IRBR3029

Queberen		<i>-</i> ,		Dougerro con			4401	<u>v</u>	accc			•							
				Fr	eane	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	_	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rar	ık		Mean		Mean	Mean
		Genera	. 1																
1 Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	1	1	5	5	15	4.19	936/1	1447	4.19	4.35	4.31	4.43	4.19
		ctor make clear			1	0	2	4	5	7	8		1297/1		3.58	4.30	4.27	4.31	3.58
		uestions reflec		_	0	21	0	0	0	2	4		****/1		****	4.66	4.33		****
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	1	1	3	6	16	4.30	725/1		4.30	4.38	4.24		4.30
				what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	5	18	4.50			4.50	4.17	4.11		4.50
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ribute 1	to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	6	17	4.50	392/1	L316	4.50	4.37	4.14	4.27	4.50
		g system clearl			0	0	4	2	5	6	10	3.59	1231/1	L427	3.59	4.33	4.19	4.20	3.59
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	celled		0	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	538/1	L447	4.89	4.79	4.69	4.72	4.89
9. How wor	 How would you grade the overall teaching effective 					0	2	1	10	10	1	3.29	1302/1	L434	3.29	4.14	4.10	4.17	3.29
	Lecture																		
1. Were th	he instr			prepared	6	0	3	2	2	6	8	3.67	1282/1	L387	3.67	4.47	4.46	4.48	3.67
	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	1	2	3	17		1090/1		4.57	4.81	4.73		4.57
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Was lecture material presented and explained clea					0	5	0	6	5	5		1302/1			4.40		4.34	
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clear Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	2	3	2	9	6		1208/1				4.32		
5. Did aud	l. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi				5	7	3	3	4	2	3	2.93	1108/1	L193	2.93	4.06	4.02	4.00	2.93
		Discus	ggion																
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	8	0	4	0	2	8	5	3.53	990/1	1172	3.53	4.42	4.15	4.25	3.53
				ed to participate	7	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40				4.61	4.35		4.40
				nd open discussion	8	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37				4.67	4.38		4.37
		echniques succe			7	3	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	345/	800	4.24		4.06	4.19	4.24
		Field	Work																
1. Did fie	eld expe			what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	20/	38	4.69	4.55	4.49	4.68	4.69
				luation criteria	14	0	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	24/	36		4.19	4.25	4.42	4.00
		ctor available			14	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54		28		4.68	4.52		
		could you disc			14	0	0	2	0	3	8	4.31	18/	30		4.39	4.30		4.31
				field activities	14	2	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	20/	27				4.62	4.27
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
																		_	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad								Re 	ason	s 				Тур	pe 			Majors 	\$
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 23						Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 2	25	Grad	duate	e	8	Majo	or	0
28-55																			
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 0 C 0						Ge	nera	1				0	Unde	er-gi	rad 1	L9	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					јh									
	Р 0						responses to be significant						ıt						
		Τ Λ		O+1	hor					Λ									

Other

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

			Fre	aner	ncies	3		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	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		****/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	0	1	4	22		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 0	22	4.75	200/1427	4.75	4.33	4.19	4.20	4.75 5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	6	28 20	5.00	1/1447 262/1434	5.00 4.63	4.79 4.14	4.69	4.72 4.17	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	Т	U	Τ	U	U	O	20	4.03	202/1434	4.03	4.14	4.10	4.1/	4.03
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			4.86	264/1170	4.86	4.67		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	****
z. were you provided with adequate background information	۷,	O	O	O	O	O	_	3.00	/ 102		1.07	1.51	1.01	
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	****
7' 11 77 1														
Field Work	1.0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4 02	17/ 20	4 02	4 55	4 40	1 (0	4 02
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0 0	0	0	1 0	0	11 11	4.83	17/ 38 1/ 36	4.83	4.55	4.49	4.68	4.83
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17					-			,	5.00	4.19	4.25	4.42	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	11		1/ 28	5.00		4.52	4.72	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17 17	0	0	0	0 1	0	11 10	5.00 4.82	1/ 30 12/ 27	5.00 4.82	4.39 4.45	4.30	4.38	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	Ι/	U	U	U	T	U	10	4.82	12/ 2/	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

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	25	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	7	Major	0	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	2							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	С	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	n	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	0	_				
				?	0							

Course-Section: EDUC 442 01

Title Process Sem ECE - Medi

Instructor: Costello,Margar

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 526 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	on Questi	ionnai	ire
---------	--------	------------	-----------	--------	-----

Over the law of	NTD	3.7.3		equer		S	_		ructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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			4.15	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		****/ 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	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	22	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	 7	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	26
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

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

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 1	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
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		****/ 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	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	6	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-	•	_	
				0	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 453 01

Title Elem Intrnshp Seminar

Instructor: Bourne,Barbara

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 528 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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		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		****/1241	****	4.66	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	3	6		745/1402		4.38	4.24	4.34	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	0	2	3	3		1283/1358		4.17	4.11	4.15	3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	5	6		710/1316		4.37	4.14	4.27	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	2	5		1117/1427		4.33	4.19	4.20	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	2	8		1168/1447		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	_					_	_						4 40	
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	Τ	Τ	6	4.63	626/1387		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		4.81	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0 1	0	8	5.00	1/1386		4.40	4.32	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6 6	0 2	0	1	1	2 1	5 3	4.50	659/1380 652/1193		4.34	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	О	2	U	Т	Т	Т	3	4.00	052/1193	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			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		4.67		4.51	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 800		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		****/ 28		4.68	4.52	4.72	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 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	****
Theory	. 0 20 01	. Dia	- wib	.+	_									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	1						

Course-Section: EDUC 457 01 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 529

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Title Scndry Intrnshp Semina Instructor: Oliva,Linda M Spring 2010

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Question	ıs		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Ran		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera																	
1. Did vo	ou gain nev			om this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	810/1	447	4.32	4.35	4.31	4.43	4.32
		tor make clear			0	0	0	2	2	9	6		1053/1		4.00	4.30	4.27	4.31	4.00
				expected goals	0	15	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1	241	****	4.66	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did ot	ther evalua	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	4	1	2	2	1	9	4.00	976/1	402	4.00	4.38	4.24	4.34	4.00
	-	-		what you learned	0	12	0	0	1	2		4.43	430/1		4.43	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.43
				to what you learned	1	2	1	0	5	2			812/1		4.00	4.37	4.14	4.27	4.00
		system clear		ined	0	0	3	2	2	2			1172/1		3.74	4.33	4.19	4.20	
		was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	4			786/1		4.79	4.79		4.72	4.79
9. How wo	ould you gi	rade the overa	all teac	ching effectiveness	3	1	0	2	2	8	3	3.80	1052/1	.434	3.80	4.14	4.10	4.17	3.80
		Lectur	re .																
		ctor's lecture			6	0	0	1	3	3	6		1153/1	387	4.08	4.47	4.46	4.48	4.08
				n the subject	6	0	0	0	0	2		4.85	681/1		4.85	4.81	4.73		4.85
		_		explained clearly	6	0	0	0	3	5			962/1		4.15	4.40	4.32		4.15
		s contribute t		-	6	0	1	2	3	1			1188/1		3.69		4.32		
5. Did a	udiovisual	techniques er	nhance y	our understanding	6	1	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	652/1	.193	4.00	4.06	4.02	4.00	4.00
		Discus																	
				what you learned	5	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	607/1		4.21	4.42	4.15	4.25	4.21
				ed to participate	5	0	0	0	2	1		4.64	450/1		4.64	4.61	4.35		4.64
		_		nd open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	0		4.57	538/1		4.57	4.67	4.38	4.51	
4. Were	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
		Semina																	
				announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	2		4.75	35/	66	4.75	4.74	4.58	4.87	
				lividual attention	11	0	0	1	2	2		3.88	54/	62	3.88	4.56	4.56	4.80	3.88
				what you learned	11	0	0	2 1	0 1	1 2		4.13	46/	58	4.13	4.52	4.41		4.13
		ns contribute or grading mad			11 11	1	0	2	1	2		3.57	50/ 49/	65 64	4.13 3.57	4.50	4.42	4.55	
o. were (criceria io	or grading mad	ie Clear		TT	1	U	4	Т	2	۷	3.57	49/	04	3.57	4.33	4.09	4.43	3.57
		Field				•	•			_	_	4 00	a = 1						
				hat you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	7		15/	38	4.88	4.55	4.49	4.68	4.88
				uation criteria	11 11	0	0	0 1	2 1	3		4.13 4.13	22/	36		4.19	4.25		4.13
		tor available		r evaluations	11	0	0	0	2	2		4.13	25/ 19/	28 30	4.13 4.25	4.68	4.52	4.72	
				ield activities	11	1	0	0	1	2		4.43	18/		4.43			4.62	
J. DIG CO	Jiirer ences	neip you carr	.y Out 1	Teru accivities	11		O	U	_	2	1	1.13	10/	27	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.02	1.13
	F						trib	ution	n										
Credits I	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	asons					Тур	e			Majors	}
00-27	00-27					Red	auir	ed fo	or Ma	 ior	 s 1	 8	 Grad	 luate	; 	3	Majo	 or	0
28-55						1000	-1~++,		110		- 1	-	3144		-	-			3
56-83						Ger	nera	1				0	Unde	r-gr	ad 1	6	Non-	-major	19
84-150																		-	
Grad.	Grad. 3 3.50-4.00 11 F 0					Ele	ecti	ves				0			Means t			_	ıh
	Р 0											_	resp	onse	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Otl	her					0							
				? 0															

Course-Section: EDUC 601 01 University of Maryland Title Human Learning/Cogniti

Baltimore County

Instructor: Filbert,Teresa Spring 2010

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 530

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

		Question	s		NR	NA		equer 2	ncies 3		5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Mean		Level Mean	Sec Mea
		Genera																
Did vo	u dain ne	w insights,ski		n this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	654/144	7 4.45	4 35	4.31	4.46	4.4
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3			281/144		4.30	4.27	4.30	4.7
		estions reflec			0	3	0	0	0	2	-	4.75			4.66		4.38	
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	1			249/1402		4.38		4.29	
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3			319/1358		4.17		4.26	
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3			188/131		4.37		4.34	
		signments contri			0	0	0	0	1	2			310/142		4.33			
	_	was class cance		rnea	1	0	0	0	2	1			1079/144			4.69	4.74	
	-			ning effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5			491/143					
. now wor	uia you g	grade the overa	II teaci	ing effectiveness	3	U	U	U	U	5	3	4.30	491/143	1 4.30	4.14	4.10	4.21	4.3
		Lectur		_														
		ctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0			5.00	1/138		4.47		4.51	
		tor seem inter		_	0	0	0	0	0		11		1/138				4.81	
		-		kplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0			5.00	1/1386		4.40			
		es contribute to	-	•	0	0	0	0	0	1	10		159/1380		4.34			
. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	205/1193	3 4.64	4.06	4.02	4.02	4.6
		Discus	sion															
. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to 1	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	124/1172	2 4.90	4.42	4.15	4.32	4.9
. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1182	2 5.00	4.61	4.35	4.46	5.0
. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage	fair and	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.67	4.38	4.52	5.0
. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.29	4.06	4.10	5.0
		Field	Work															
. Did fi	eld exper	ience contribu	te to wl	nat you learned	2	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	31/ 38	3 4.22	4.55	4.49	4.77	4.2
				lation criteria	3	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	29/ 30	3.88	4.19	4.25	4.39	3.8
_	_	tor available :			3	2	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 28	3 5.00	4.68	4.52	4.83	5.0
. To what	t dearee	could you disc	uss vou	evaluations	3	0	0	1	0	4		4.13	21/ 30	4.13	4.39	4.30	4.66	4.1
				ield activities	3	4	0	0	0	3		4.25	21/ 2				4.71	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ution	ı									
redits Ea	arm od	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Dor	asons				m-				Majors	-
		Cuiii. GPA												/pe 				,
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	8	Graduat	ce	6	Majo	r	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-	grad	5	Non-	major	9
	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
34-150	6	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	Jh
	О	3.30 1.00																
84-150 Grad.	б	3.30 1.00		P 0									respons	ses to b	e sigr	nificar	ıt	

Course-Section: EDUC 602 03 University of Maryland Title Instructional Sys Dev

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 531

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 10 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Hodell,Charles

Instructor:

			Fre	equei	ncie	q		Tngt	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	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
 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
1. Here special econniques successivi	U	U	U	U	4	_	_	1.20	330/ 000	1.20	1.27	1.00	1.10	1.20
Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	ution	n									

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 6	0.00-0.99	8	 А	7	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	3	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 603 01 University of Maryl Title Instr Sys Dev II Baltimore County Instructor: Petska, Deborah Spring 2010

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 532

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	11		
Questionnaires:	11	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	е

		Questions	\$		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General																
1. Did you	gain new	insights, skil		this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	474/1447	4.60	4.35	4.31	4.46	4.60
		or make clear			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 ques	stions reflect	the exp	ected goals	1	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.66	4.33	4.38	5.00
4. Did oth	er evaluat	tions reflect	the expe	cted goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	281/1402	4.70	4.38	4.24	4.29	4.70
5. Did ass:	igned read	dings contribu	ite to wh	at 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 wri	tten assig	gnments contri	bute 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
		system clearly	-	ed	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	154/1427	4.80	4.33	4.19	4.25	4.80
		as class cance			1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	485/1447	4.90	4.79	4.69	4.74	4.90
9. How would	ld you gra	ade the overal	l teachi	ng effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	634/1434	4.25	4.14	4.10	4.21	4.25
		Lecture	<u>:</u>															
1. Were the	e instruct	tor's lectures		epared	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	230/1387	4.89	4.47	4.46	4.51	4.89
		or seem intere	_	-	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.81	4.73	4.81	5.00
				lained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	290/1386	4.78	4.40	4.32	4.43	4.78
		contribute to			2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	312/1380	4.78	4.34	4.32	4.38	4.78
5. Did aud	iovisual t	techniques enh	ance you	r understanding	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	186/1193	4.67	4.06	4.02	4.02	4.67
		- ·	,															
1 Did ala	Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learn						1	0	1	1	7	4.30	546/1172	4.30	4.42	4.15	4.32	4.30
	Were all students actively encouraged to participat					0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	400/1182	4.70	4.42	4.15	4.32	4.70
						0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	459/1170	4.70	4.67	4.38	4.52	4.70
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussi 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
1. WEIG BP	Were special techniques successful				_	U	O	O	_	2	,	1.00	1337 000	1.00	1.25	1.00	1.10	1.00
		Laborat	ory															
2. Were you	u provideo	d with adequat	e backgr	ound information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.67	4.34	4.79	****
		Seminar																
1. Were as	signed tor			nnounced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.74	4.58	4.71	****
				at you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.52	4.41	4.75	****
		s contribute t			10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.64	****
_		r grading made	_		10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	4.35	4.09	4.18	****
1 5 1 5 1		Field W			1.0	0	•	0	•	0	-	F 00	***** / 20	ale ale ale ale	4 55	4 40	4 55	als als als als
		ence contribut understand you			10 10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38 ****/ 36	****	4.55 4.19	4.49 4.25	4.77 4.39	****
2. Dia you	crearry (understand you	ir evalua	tion criteria	10	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	***/ 36		4.19	4.25	4.39	
	Fr							ıtior	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade								Rea	sons				Тур	pe			Majors	
00.27 1 0.00.000 0 7 6																		
00-27 28-55	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 6 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2					Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors		9	Graduate	е	8	Majo	r	6
28-55 56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	neral					0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	5
84-150					001		=				-	011401 9		_	2.011		3	
Grad.					Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h	
	P 0						'						response				_	
				I 0		Otl	ner					0			3			
				? 0														

Course-Section: EDUC 625 01 Univer
Title Teach Read Writ ELS I Bal

Instructor: Shin, Sarah J

Enrollment: 10

Questionnaires: 9 Student

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 533 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Ctudent	Course	Evaluation	Ougetionn	2 i 2 c

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

Credits Ea	arned	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	В	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	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: EDUC 644 01 University of Maryland Title

Page 534

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Baltimore County Ling/Esol Educators Instructor: Shin,Sarah J Spring 2010

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 12 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Question	s			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
2. Did the 3. Did the 4. Did oth 5. Did ass 6. Did wri 7. Was the 8. How man	e instructe exam quality example of the control of	Genera www insights, ski ctor make clear estions reflect actions reflect eadings contrib signments contr g system clearl was class canc grade the overa	lls fro the ex t the e the ex ute to ibute t y expla elled	pected goal xpected goal pected goal what you le o what you ined	.s als .s earned learned	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 1 2 0 2 0 0	0 0 1 3 0 0 2 0	12 12 10 7 12 10 10 12 6	5.00 5.00 4.75 4.42 5.00 4.67 4.83 5.00 4.86	1/1447 1/1447 282/1241 603/1402 1/1358 239/1316 133/1427 1/1447 102/1434	5.00 5.00 4.75 4.42 5.00 4.67 4.83 5.00 4.86	4.35 4.30 4.66 4.38 4.17 4.37 4.33 4.79 4.14	4.31 4.27 4.33 4.24 4.11 4.14 4.19 4.69 4.10	4.46 4.30 4.38 4.29 4.26 4.34 4.25 4.74 4.21	
2. Did the 3. Was led 4. Did the 5. Did aud 1. Did cla 2. Were al	Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clear 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand: Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learne 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participat 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discuss: 4. Were special techniques successful							0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 1 0 0	0 0 0 0 3	12 12 11 12 9	5.00 5.00 4.83 5.00 4.75 4.67 4.33	1/1387 1/1387 217/1386 1/1380 131/1193 282/1172 691/1182	5.00 5.00 4.83 5.00 4.75 4.67 4.33	4.47 4.81 4.40 4.34 4.06	4.46 4.73 4.32 4.32 4.02	4.51 4.81 4.43 4.38 4.02	5.00 4.83 5.00 4.75 4.67 4.33
		_		d open disc	ussion	0	0	0 1	0	0 2	3 1	9 8	4.75 4.25	390/1170 335/ 800	4.75 4.25	4.67 4.29	4.38 4.06	4.52 4.10	4.75 4.25
					Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades				Rea	ason	3			Typ	e			Majors	;
00-27 28-55 56-83 84-150 Grad.	5 0 0 0 2	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	0 0 0 0 0	A B C D F P I ?	7 1 0 0 0 0 0 0		Ge:	quire quire nera ectiv	1	or Ma	 ajor		0 0 0	Graduate Under-gr #### - M response	ad 1 Ieans t		are not	major enoug	11 1

Frequencies

Instructor

Course-Section: EDUC 648 01 University of Maryland Page 535
Title Consulting Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010
Instructor: Buelow, John W. Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

0

84-150 Grad. 3.00-3.49 0

3.50-4.00

D 0

F 0

0

0

0

P

I

8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from	this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	179/1447	4.88	4.35	4.31	4.46	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the exp	ected 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 ex	pected 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 exp	ected 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 wi	nat 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 explain	ned	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 teach	ing 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 p	repared	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 ex	plained 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 y	ou 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 yo	ur 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 w	nat 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
	Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Тур	e			Majors	
00 07 0 0 0 0 0 0									า						
00-27 0 $0.00-0.99$ 0 $28-55$ 0 $1.00-1.99$ 0	A 8 B 0	Required for Majors					S	3	Graduate	!	7	Majo	r	1/	
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General							0	Under-gr	ad	1	Non-	major	1

Electives

Other

5

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

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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		****/ 20	****		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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	 А	17	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	7	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-		_	
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 655 01 University of Maryland Title Tch Read Writ ELS II Baltimore County Instructor: Crandall, Joann Spring 2010

Enrollment:

Grad.

15

3.50-4.00 9

23

f Maryland Page 537 County JUN 28, 2010 2010 Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Questionnaires: 22	2	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
--------------------	---	---------	--------	------------	---------------

0

0

0

0

F

Ρ

Ι

2 acceronn	WII 00 -			Seddelle Cou	50	_,		Q·				•						
							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m 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	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected 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	e exam q	questions reflect	t the e	xpected goals	1	10	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	599/1241	4.45	4.66	4.33	4.38	4.45
4. Did otl	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	259/1402	4.71	4.38	4.24	4.29	4.71
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o 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	e gradin	g system clearly	y expla	ined	2	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	120/1427	4.85	4.33	4.19	4.25	4.85
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		2	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	485/1447	4.90	4.79	4.69	4.74	4.90
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	105/1434	4.84	4.14	4.10	4.21	4.84
		Lecture	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	200/1387	4.90	4.47	4.46	4.51	4.90
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subjec					0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1387		4.81		4.81	5.00
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained cle					0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	,		4.40	4.32	4.43	
		es contribute to			2	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85				4.32		
				our understanding	1	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67						
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	289/1172	4.65	4.42	4.15	4.32	4.65
				d to participate	2	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55			4.61	4.35	4.46	4.55
				d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90			4.67	4.38	4.52	
		echniques succes		a open arboabbien	2	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	90/ 800		4.29	4.06	4.10	
		Semina	r															
1. Were as	ssigned			announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.74	4.58	4.71	****
				Frequ	ien <i>c</i> s	nie:	trih	1+ i 01	n									
				11040	acticy	DIS	CIID	20101										
Credits E	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	,			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 20		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s 1	.9	Graduat	e 1	 L5	Majo	r	19
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														

Electives

Other

2

0

Course-Section: EDUC 667 01

Grammar For Amer Engl

Title Grammar For Am Instructor: Nelson, John E

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 24

elson, John E Spring 2010

Page 538 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Erc	aniar	ncies			Inct	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
׫«» « « « « « « « « « « « « « « « « « «														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	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														
 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		•	•		•	_		4 = 0	040/4450	4 50			4 00	4 50
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														
Laboratory	2.2	0	0	0	0	0	1	г оо	++++/ 100	****	1 67	1 21	4 00	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0		0		0	1		****/ 189	****	4.67	4.34	4.82	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 192	****	4.67	4.34	4.79	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 186	****	4.67	4.48	4.73	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23 23	0	0	0	0	0	1 1		****/ 187 ****/ 168	****	4.67 ****	4.33	4.67 4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 100			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		****/ 62	****	4.56	4.56	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	4.52	4.41	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 64	****	4.35	4.09	4.18	****
J. Here officera for grading made officer		Ū	Ū	ŭ	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	, 01		1.55	1.05	1110	
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		****/ 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		****/ 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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	2						

Course-Section: EDUC 678 01

Inst Strat/Div Needs

Title Instructor: Berge, Nancy B

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 539 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	on Questi	ionnai	ire
---------	--------	------------	-----------	--------	-----

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	_	0	0	^	1	_	1.0	4 52	FCO /1 4 4 7	4 52	4 25	4 21	1 10	4 52
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	10 11	4.53 4.65	562/1447 376/1447	4.53 4.65	4.35	4.31 4.27	4.46 4.30	4.53 4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	717/1241	4.33	4.50	4.27	4.38	4.03
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		****/ 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	****

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	12	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	10	Major	6	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	11	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0							
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n	
				P	0		responses to be s		be si	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	0					
				?	0							

Course-Section: EDUC 681 01

FDOC 081 OI

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

			Frequencies			Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
׫«»«»»														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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		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		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		4.22	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	4.42	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	-	3.67	612/ 800	3.67	4.07	4.06	4.10	3.67
4. Weie special techniques successiul	4	0	U		U	_	_	3.07	012/ 000	3.07	4.23	4.00	4.10	3.07
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		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		****/ 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		****/ 58	****	4.52	4.41	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 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	4.77	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 28	****	4.19	4.52	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 30	****	4.39	4.30	4.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 27	****	4.45	4.43	4.71	****
J. Did conferences help you carry out freid activities	,	U	U	U	U	_		1.50	/ 2/		1.13	1.13	1./1	
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

Surv Of Instr Tech App

Title 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

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

Course-Section: EDUC 681 01

000 661 01

Surv Of Instr Tech App

Instructor: Ira,Katherine E (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 12
Questionnaires: 11

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 541 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Ctudant	('011760	Evaluation	()110ct10	nnaira

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
<u> </u>														
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		4.79	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
. 3														
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		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		1220/1386		4.40		4.43	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2			1198/1380		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
5. Dia dadiovibadi teelmiqueb elimanee your anderbeanding	Ü	Ü	O	0	-	-	-	1.00	032/11/3	1.33	1.00	1.02	1.02	1.33
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		4.61	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		3.67		3.67	4.29	4.06	4.10	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	O	U	_	U	_	_	3.07	012/ 000	3.07	4.27	1.00	4.10	3.07
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		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		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		****/ 168	****	****	4.33	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for tab reports clearly specified	9	U	U	U	U	T	Τ	4.50	/ 100			4.20	4.55	
Seminar														
	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4 E0	****/ 66	****	4.74	4.58	4.71	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 62	****				++++
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	4.56 4.52	4.56	4.69 4.75	****
1 3	9	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 65	****	4.52	4.41	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 64	****		4.42		****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	U	U	U	U	Τ	Τ	4.50	^^^^/ 64	^ ^ ^ ^	4.35	4.09	4.18	
77 - 1 2 77 1-														
Field Work	0	_	0	0	^	-	1	4 50	****/ 20		4 55	4 40	4 77	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 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		****/ 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	****
0.10 - 1														
Self Paced	^	^	•	•	•	_	_	4 = 6		4.4.1.1	4 ==	4 = 6	4 0=	at at 1 1
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 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

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

Course-Section: EDUC 688 01

Title Methodology Teach ELS

Nelson, John E Instructor:

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 542 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Cour	se Evaluation	Questionnair	е
--------------	---------------	--------------	---

	Frequencies			Instructor			Course Dept		ot UMBC Level		Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	^	0	0	1	7	4 00	170/1447	4 00	4 25	4 21	1 10	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	/	4.88	179/1447	4.88 4.50	4.35	4.31 4.27	4.46	4.88
 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 	0	0	0	0	1	_	4	4.50	532/1447	4.63	4.30 4.66	4.27	4.30	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	6 6	4.63 4.38	427/1241 645/1402	4.63	4.88	4.33	4.38	4.63 4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.38	4.24	4.29	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	392/1316	4.50	4.17	4.11	4.34	4.50
	0	0	0	0	U T	5	3	4.38	632/1427	4.38	4.37	4.14	4.34	4.38
. Was the grading system clearly explained . How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	2	5 6	4.75	836/1447	4.75	4.33	4.19	4.74	4.75
. How many times was class cancelled . How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	733/1434		4.14	4.10		4.17
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	U	U	U	1	3	4	4.1/	/33/1434	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		****/ 66	****	4.74	4.58	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 62	****	4.56	4.56	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 58	****	4.52	4.41	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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	****
nd all a woods														
Field Work	_	0	0	0	0	1	1	4 50	22/ 20	4 50	4 55	4 40	4 77	4 50
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	-	0	•	Τ	1	4.50	23/ 38	4.50 4.00	4.55	4.49	4.77	4.50
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6 6	0 1	0	0	1	0	1		24/ 36 ****/ 28	4.00	4.19 4.68	4.25 4.52	4.39 4.83	4.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	10/ 30	4.50	4.68	4.52	4.83	4.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 27	4.5U ****	4.39	4.30	4.00	4.5U ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out freid activities	O	Τ	U	U	т	U	U	3.00	2/		4.40	4.43	4./⊥	

Credits E	Credits Earned Cum		1	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	5	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	2	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	Electives 0		there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	1						

Course-Section: EDUC 710 01

Title Cult & Design Info. Co

Instructor: Young,Patricia

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 6 Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 543 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

					Frequencies				Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 General															
1 Did you	cain ne		s from this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	927/1447	4.20	4.35	4.31	4.46	4.20
_	_	-	the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	1		1323/1447		4.30	4.27	4.30	3.50
			the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	685/1402		4.38	4.24	4.29	4.33
			te to what you learned	-	0	1	0	2	1	2		1170/1358		4.17	4.11	4.26	3.50
	_	-	oute to what you learn		0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	549/1316		4.37	4.14	4.34	4.33
		g system clearly	_	0	0	0	2	0	2	2		1201/1427		4.33	4.19	4.25	3.67
		was class cancel	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1447		4.79	4.69	4.74	5.00
	_		. teaching effectivene	-	0	0	1	2	3	0		1293/1434		4.14	4.10	4.21	3.33
J. 110W WOU	ia you s	grade the overall	. ccaciffing cffcccfvciic		J	J	_	2	3	J	3.33	1275/1151	3.33	1.11	1.10	1.21	3.33
		Lecture															
		uctor's lectures		0	0	0	1	2	2	1		1304/1387		4.47	4.46	4.51	3.50
			ted in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	,		4.81	4.73	4.81	4.83
		_	and explained clearly		0	0	1	1	4	0		1258/1386		4.40	4.32	4.43	3.50
			what you learned	0	0		0	4	0	2		1198/1380		4.34	4.32	4.38	3.67
5. Did aud	iovisual	l techniques enha	nce your understandir	ng 0	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	288/1193	4.50	4.06	4.02	4.02	4.50
		Discussi	.on														
1. Did cla	ss discu	ussions contribut	e to what you learned	a 0	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	710/1172	4.00	4.42	4.15	4.32	4.00
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate					0	0	0	2	4	4.67	430/1182	4.67	4.61	4.35	4.46	4.67
3. Did the	instruc	ctor encourage fa	ir and open discussion	on 0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	480/1170	4.67	4.67	4.38	4.52	4.67
4. Were sp	ecial te	echniques success	ful	0	1	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	789/ 800	2.20	4.29	4.06	4.10	2.20
		Seminar															
1 Were as	signed t		to the announced theme	. 5	0	0	0	0	1	Ο	4 00	****/ 66	****	4.74	4.58	4.71	****
	_	-	or individual attention		0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 62		4.56	4.56	4.69	****
			te to what you learned		0		0	0	0	1		****/ 58		4.52	4.41	4.75	****
	_	-	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 65		4.50	4.42	4.64	****
_		for grading made	_	5	0		0	1	0	0		****/ 64		4.35	4.09	4.18	***
J. WEIG GI	icciia i	ior grading made	CICAI	3	J	Ü	J	-	Ü	J	3.00	, 01		1.33	1.05	1.10	
		Self Pa				_								4 ==	4 50		***
	_	-	e to what you learned		0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	,		4.75	4.72	4.85	****
3. Were yo	ur conta	acts with the ins	structor nelpiul	5	0	0	U	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.64	4.59	****
	F						outio	on									
Credits Ea	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad						Re	easons	5			Ту	рe			Majors	;
00-27	1		0 A 4		Re	equir	red i	or Ma	ajor	S	0	Graduat	e	5	Majo	or	0
28-55	0		0 B 1 C 0		~		. 1				0	TT		1	37		_
56-83						enera	ΣL				0	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	-major	6
84-150	-					1 '	!				_	шшпп	M	- lo			.lo
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	6 F 0		E.	lecti	ıves				6	#### -				_	111
		P 0			Otaliana			0	responses to be significant								
		I 0			Ot	ther					0						
	? 0																

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

Questions		NA	Fre	equer 2	cies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC :	Level Mean	Sect Mean
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		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		****/1241	****	4.66	4.33	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	7	5	5		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		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		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		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		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		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		1351/1380	2.60		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		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		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		****/ 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		****/ 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		****/ 58	***	4.52	4.41	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	2	0	0	0		****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	U	U	U	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

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	Ą	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons	Reasons Type				
00-27	 5	0.00-0.99	1	 А	17	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	11	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other		-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 781 1
Title Teacher Leadership

Title Teacher Leadersh Instructor: Espinosa, Laura

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 545 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Ctudant	('Ollive')	Evaluation	Ougetion	n n n n n

Ouestions				equer		s.	_		ructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	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		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	
Quantum and														
Seminar	0	1	0	0	0	_	1 2	4 07	07/ 66	4 07	4 7 4	4 50	4 71	4 07
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	J	14 12	4.93	17/ 62 21/ 58	4.93 4.80	4.56 4.52	4.56 4.41	4.69	4.93
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0		3	14		,	4.80	4.52	4.41	4.75 4.64	4.80
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear			0	0	0	7	12	4.93	12/ 65 14/ 64	4.93	4.35	4.42	4.04	4.93
5. Were criteria for grading made crear		0	U	U	U	3	12	4.80	14/ 04	4.80	4.35	4.09	4.18	4.80
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ition	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	18	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 781 2 University of M.
Title Teacher Leadership Baltimore Co
Instructor: Espinosa, Laura Spring 20

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

1

University of Maryland Page 546
Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010
Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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						4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1			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	
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	,
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 2 1					 or Ma			1	Graduat		0	Maic		

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l 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	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	are not enough		
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other		_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 791 01

Title Practicum In Ed Sec 7-

Instructor: Murphy, Joyce A

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 16 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 547 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	0	0	0	1	0	_	-	2 04	1100/1445	4 47	4 25	4 21	1 10	2 04
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2 1	0	0	5	,	4.31	1128/1447		4.35	4.31 4.27	4.46 4.30	3.94
 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 	0	10	0	0	0	2	8 4	4.67	792/1447 380/1241	4.41 4.71	4.30	4.27	4.30	4.31 4.67
-	0	10	1	0	1	6	8	4.67	766/1402	4.71	4.00	4.33	4.38	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	0	11	4.25	551/1358	4.54	4.38	4.24	4.29	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	-	-	1	1	1									
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	Τ	Τ	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	Τ	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		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		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		4.42	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		4.61	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		4.67	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		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		4.50	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
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	4	U			1	U	J	4.45	30/ 04	4.43	4.33	4.03	4.10	1.43

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	9	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	#### - Means there		a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: EDUC 791 01 University of Marylar Title Prac In Ed Tesol K-12 Baltimore County Instructor: Wilson, Margaret Spring 2010

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 6

7

University of Maryland Page 548
Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010
Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

							Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1447	4.47	4.35	4.31	4.46	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	532/1447	4.41	4.30	4.27	4.30	4.50
		estions reflec			0	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1241	4.71	4.66	4.33	4.38	4.75
	_	uations reflect		1 3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	143/1402		4.38	4.24	4.29	4.83
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	122/1358	4.57	4.17	4.11	4.26	4.83
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	112/1316	4.48	4.37	4.14	4.34	4.83
		system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	133/1427	4.55	4.33	4.19	4.25	4.83
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	958/1447	4.80	4.79	4.69	4.74	4.67
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	278/1434	4.15	4.14	4.10	4.21	4.60
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instri	actor's lecture	_	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	4.20	4.47	4.46	4.51	5.00
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	6		1/1387	4.60	4.81	4.73	4.81	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5		217/1386		4.40	4.32	4.43	4.83
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	0	6		1/1380			4.32	4.38	5.00
				our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	3		288/1193		4.06	4.02		4.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	163/1172	4.52	4.42	4.15	4.32	4.83
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	5				4.61	4.35	4.46	4.83
				d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	295/1170	4.68	4.67	4.38	4.52	4.83
		echniques succe			0	0	1	0	0	3	2		547/ 800		4.29	4.06	4.10	3.83
				Frequ	ency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
				_														
Credits E	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту:	pe 			Majors	S
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 3					Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajora	S	6	Graduat	е	4	Majo	or	5
28-55																		
56-83						Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	-major	1
84-150	4-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0																	
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0									respons	es to k	e sign	ificar	ıt	
I 0				Otl	her					0								

? 1

Course-Section: EDUC 792 01

Int In Edu Tesol K-12

Title Int In Edu Teso Instructor: Stein, Hollis G

Enrollment: 4
Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 549 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Ctudant	('011760	Evaluation	()110ct10	nnaira

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General	0	^	0	0	^	_	4	F 00	1 /1 4 4 7	4 27	4 25	4 21	1 10	F 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447			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 1/1241	4.52	4.30	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3 1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	4.90 4.46	4.66	4.33	4.38 4.29	5.00 5.00
	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1402	4.40	4.38	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1			166/1316		4.17	4.11		
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4.75	,		4.37	4.14	4.34	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1427		4.33	4.19	4.25	5.00
	•	0	0	0	0	•	4		1/1447		4.79	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	U	U	U	U	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	•		_	_				- 00					4 00	
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1172		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		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	_		_	_			_	- 00			4 ==	4 50	4 0=	
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			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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected G	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	3	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	2	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в С)						
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 C)						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	3	F C)	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 0 .

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

18

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 550 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
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		****/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		****/ 38	5.00	4.55	4.49	4.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 36	5.00	4.19	4.25	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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	1.00	****/ 31		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	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	crib	ution	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	11	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	9	Major	0		
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	#### - Means there are not enough				
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant			
				I	0	Other	0	-		_			
				2	Λ								

Course-Section: EDUC 792 3 University of Maryland Title ISD Internship Irish,Teresa J. Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 551

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 15 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions				NR	NA	Fre	equencies 2 3 4 5			5	Instructor Mean Rank			Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
1 544	General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course							2	_	1	_	2 72	1065/1	117	4 27	4 25	1 21	1 10	2 72
					0	0	0	2 2	6 5	1 1	6 7		1265/1 1168/1		4.37 4.52		4.31	4.46	3.73 3.87
	 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 						0	0	0	1			231/1		4.52	4.30	4.27	4.30	4.80
	4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals							2	4	2			1107/1			4.38	4.33	4.29	3.86
				what you learned	0	1 7	0 1	0	2	2	3		1022/1		4.42	4.17	4.11	4.26	3.75
				o what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	7	_		812/1		4.49			4.34	4.00
	grading system			-	1	0	0	3	2	2	7		1055/1		4.54		4.19	4.25	3.93
	times was cla	-		illed	1	0	0	0	0	2			619/1			4.79	4.69		4.86
-				hing effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	6	1		1052/1			4.14	4.10	4.21	3.80
J. How woul	a you grade co	ne overa.	II ccac	ining cricectveness	3	Ü	Ü	Ü	3	Ü	-	3.00	1032/1	151	1.33		1.10	1.21	3.00
		Lecture	_		6	0	0	1											
	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared								2	1	5		1137/1		4.58	4.47	4.46	4.51	4.11
	instructor see				5	0	0	0	1	3	6		1143/1		4.77	4.81	4.73	4.81	4.50
		-		xplained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	2			811/1		4.73	4.40	4.32	4.43	4.33
	lectures cont			-	6	0	0	2	2	1			1162/1			4.34	4.32		3.78
5. Did audi	ovisual techni	iques en	hance y	our understanding	6	1	2	0	3	1	2	3.13	1070/1	193	4.10	4.06	4.02	4.02	3.13
		Discus	sion																
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned							0	0	4	0	5	4.11	666/1	172	4.61	4.42	4.15	4.32	4.11
2. Were all	students act	ively en	courage	d to participate	6	0	0	1	4	0	4	3.78	1005/1	182	4.53	4.61	4.35	4.46	3.78
				d open discussion	6	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	864/1	170	4.67	4.67	4.38	4.52	4.00
4. Were spe	cial technique	es succe	ssful	-	6	3	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	612/	800	4.26	4.29	4.06	4.10	3.67
		Semina	r																
1 Were agg	igned topics			announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/	66	4.90	4.74	4.58	4.71	****
				lividual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	62	4.83	4.56	4.56	4.69	****
				what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	58	4.92	4.52	4.41	4.75	****
	entations con			-	14	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/	65	4.92	4.50	4.42	4.64	****
_	teria for grad			-	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	64	4.80	4.35	4.09	4.18	****
													,						
		Self 1							_										
				what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	24/	31	4.75	4.75	4.72	4.85	4.50
	y questions ma				11	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	17/	21	4.50	4.50	4.57	4.65	4.00
	r contacts with				11	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	24/	31	4.75	4.75	4.64	4.59	4.50
	feedback/tuto		_	_	11	1	0	0	0	1	2		****/	20	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.56	****
5. Were the	re enough pro	ctors io	r all t	ne students	11	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/	15	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.80	***
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	1										
Credits Ear	ned (Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons					Тур	oe.			Majors	
00-27		0-0.99	0	A 11		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s 1	4	Grad	uate	2	4	Majo	r	0
28-55 56-83		0-1.99 0-2.99	0	B 3 C 0		Ger	neral					0	Unde	r-ar	rad 1	1	Non-	-major	15
84-150		0-2.99	1	D 0		Gei	ierai	-				U	onae	ı-gı	.au I	1	NOII-	·ilia JUI	13
Grad.		0-4.00	12	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	####	- N	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
				P 0									resp	onse	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner					0							
? 0																			

Course-Section: EDUC 794 01 University of Maryland Title ISD Project Seminar

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Instructor: Kinerney,Donna Enrollment:

10 Questionnaires: 10

Page 552 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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
To a second		D-1	2 1		_									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	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	#### - Means there are no			
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant		
				I	0	Other	0					
				?	0							

Course-Section: EDUC 795 1

Sem Study Teaching

Title Smith, Murdux Instructor:

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 553 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course Dept				Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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		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		****/ 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	***
Frequ	ency	nist	-rih	utio	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	 А	17	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	12	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	18	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						