Course-Section: EDUC 305 0101

Title TCHNG RDG & WRTING ECE

Instructor: BERMAN, JILLIAN

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 511 JUN 14, 2005 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	1	0	1	4	5	4	2	3.13	1438/1504	3.13	4.43	4.27	4.27	3.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	4	5	4	2	3.13	1403/1503	3.13	4.34	4.20	4.22	3.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1290	****	4.56	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	4	5	4	2	3.13	1390/1453	3.13	4.43	4.21	4.23	3.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	3	5	6	3.81	935/1421	3.81	4.31	4.00	4.01	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	7	3	3	3.25	1249/1365	3.25	4.38	4.08	4.08	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	4	5	3	3.38	1319/1485	3.38	4.33	4.16	4.17	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	708/1504	4.88	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	4	2	4	3	2	2.80	1415/1483	2.80	4.18	4.06	4.08	2.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	4	5	5	2	3.31	1336/1425	3.31	4.50	4.41	4.43	3.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	1242/1426	4.31	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	5	3	4	4	3.44	1272/1418	3.44	4.45	4.25	4.26	3.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	4	2	1	3	2.44	1385/1416	2.44	4.35	4.26	4.27	2.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	872/1199	3.64	4.07	3.97	4.02	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	3	0	4	3	3.08	1136/1312	3.08	4.47	4.00	4.09	3.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	2	5	4	3.77	1044/1303	3.77	4.67	4.24	4.27	3.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	1	2	3	5	3.62	1089/1299	3.62	4.72	4.25	4.30	3.62
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	2	3	3	2	3.27	644/ 758	3.27	4.28	4.01	4.00	3.27

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Ĺ
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 310 0101

Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION

Instructor: King, Betty

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 512 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Over this area	MD	3.7.7	Fre	_	ncies		_		ructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA		2	3	4 	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	0	9	5	4.00	1092/1504	4.43	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	3	7	3.88	1150/1503	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.22	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	832/1290	4.48	4.56	4.28	4.31	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	764/1453	4.56	4.43	4.21	4.23	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	2	5	4	3.38	1189/1421	4.04	4.31	4.00	4.01	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	8	4	3.88	922/1365	4.37	4.38	4.08	4.08	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	1	2	1	6	3.13	1372/1485	3.92	4.33	4.16	4.17	3.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1504	4.71	4.83	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	3	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	961/1483	4.29	4.18	4.06	4.08	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	1117/1425	4.46	4.50	4.41	4.43	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	572/1426	4.94	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	4	4	6	3.88	1110/1418	4.34	4.45	4.25	4.26	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	3	7		1112/1416		4.35	4.26	4.27	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	2	1	3	4	3.90	,		4.07	3.97	4.02	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	2	6	4.00	716/1312	4.50	4.47	4.00	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	415/1299	4.85	4.72	4.25	4.30	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	2	2	3	4.13	364/ 758	4.40	4.28	4.01	4.00	4.13
1. Wele special techniques successiul	5	J	U	U	2	3	5	1.13	304/ /30	1.10	1.20	4.U1	1.00	T.13
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	38/ 58	4.67	4.42	4.43	4.52	4.67
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	36/ 56	4.33	4.29	4.23	4.13	4.33
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 44	****	4.77	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	18/ 47	4.75	4.38	4.29	4.14	4.75

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: EDUC 310 0301

INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION

Instructor: BOURNE, BARBARA

Enrollment: 7
Questionnaires: 7

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 513 JUN 14, 2005 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														
	0	0	0	0	0	1	_	4 06	160/1504	4 42	4 42	4 07	4 07	4 06
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	Ţ	6	4.86	168/1504	4.43	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	258/1503	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.22	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	250/1290	4.48	4.56	4.28	4.31	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	129/1453	4.56	4.43	4.21	4.23	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	182/1421	4.04	4.31	4.00	4.01	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	100/1365	4.37	4.38	4.08	4.08	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	240/1485	3.92	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1155/1504	4.71	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	211/1483	4.29	4.18	4.06	4.08	4.67
Lecture														
	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.80	331/1425	4.46	4.50	4.41	4.43	4.80
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	-	0	0	0	Τ	4		,					
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	4.94	4.80	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	191/1418	4.34	4.45	4.25	4.26	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	Τ	4	4.80	255/1416	4.34	4.35	4.26	4.27	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	429/1199	4.12	4.07	3.97	4.02	4.33
Discussion														
	2	0	0	0	0	0	_	5.00	1/1312	4.50	4.47	4.00	4.09	5.00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	-	-	0	-	0	5		, -				1.02	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1299	4.85	4.72	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	U	U	U	1	2	4.67	132/ 758	4.40	4.28	4.01	4.00	4.67

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

Course-Section: EDUC 311 0101

PSYC FOUNDATION OF EDU

Title Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI

Enrollment: 25

Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 514 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	1						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	1	1	7	4	4.08	1061/1504	4.21	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	209/1503	4.68	4.34	4.20	4.22	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	290/1290	4.69	4.56	4.28	4.31	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	186/1453	4.68	4.43	4.21	4.23	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	5	6	4.00	745/1421	4.21	4.31	4.00	4.01	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	297/1365	4.55	4.38	4.08	4.08	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	190/1485	4.68	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	879/1504	4.72	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	850/1483	3.95	4.18	4.06	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1425	4.83	4.50	4.41	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1426	4.97	4.80	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1418	4.97	4.45	4.25	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	366/1416	4.60	4.35	4.26	4.27	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	224/1199	4.69	4.07	3.97	4.02	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	414/1312	4.63	4.47	4.00	4.09	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	540/1303	4.72	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	354/ 758	4.52	4.28	4.01	4.00	4.14

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	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	11				
				?	0						

WILLIAMS, VICKI

University of Maryland PSYC FOUNDATION OF EDU

Baltimore County

Spring 2005

Page 515 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 15

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	\$		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	-	Mean	Mean	Mean
~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	1	11	4.33	788/1504	4.21	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	380/1503	4.68	4.34	4.20	4.22	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	344/1290	4.69	4.56	4.28	4.31	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	331/1453	4.68	4.43	4.21	4.23	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	392/1421	4.21	4.31	4.00	4.01	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	223/1365	4.55	4.38	4.08	4.08	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	349/1485	4.68	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	983/1504	4.72	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	989/1483	3.95	4.18	4.06	4.08	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	572/1425	4.83	4.50	4.41	4.43	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	351/1426	4.97	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.93	88/1418	4.97	4.45	4.25	4.26	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	675/1416	4.60	4.35	4.26	4.27	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	105/1199	4.69	4.07	3.97	4.02	4.80
Discussion	_		•	•	•		•	4 00	164/1010	4 60	4 45	4 00	4 00	4 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	164/1312		4.47	4.00	4.09	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	197/1303	4.72	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1299		4.72	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	66/ 758	4.52	4.28	4.01	4.00	4.89
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 233	****	4.67	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 244	***	4.55	4.09	4.12	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 227	***	4.69	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 225	***	4.83	4.40	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 207	***	4.80	4.23	4.14	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports crearry specified	14	U	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	/ 207		4.00	4.09	4.14	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.47	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.06	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.51	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.18	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.42	4.43	4.52	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 56	5.00	4.29	4.23	4.13	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.77	4.65	4.77	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/ 47	5.00	4.38	4.29	4.14	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.57	4.44	4.47	5.00
0.15 - 1														
Self Paced	1.0	^	0	0	_	0	_	F 00	****	باد باد بازر بازر	4 06	4 50	4 17 4	***
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.26	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00 ****/	35	***	4.30	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00 ****/	36	****	4.69	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00 ****/	20	****	3.04	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00 ****/	16	****	4.48	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: EDUC 311 0201

Title PSYC FOUNDATION OF EDU

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 15

WILLIAMS, VICKI 16

Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 515 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Δ	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	 L3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	0	-					
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	2						

Course-Section: EDUC 312 0101

ANALYSIS OF TCHNG & LR

Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 17

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 516 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	8	3	4	3.47	1364/1504	3.28	4.43	4.27	4.27	3.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	5	5	3.71	1231/1503	2.94	4.34	4.20	4.22	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/1290	3.45	4.56	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	3	5	5	3.69	1221/1453	3.43	4.43	4.21	4.23	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	7	4	4	1	2.94	1327/1421	2.70	4.31	4.00	4.01	2.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	4	4	4	3.35	1218/1365	2.99	4.38	4.08	4.08	3.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	3	5	5	3.53	1276/1485	2.90	4.33	4.16	4.17	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	4	12		1075/1504	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	3	0	1	3	6	1	3.64	1183/1483	3.37	4.18	4.06	4.08	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	1076/1425	3.43	4.50	4.41	4.43	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	860/1426	4.03	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	905/1418	3.43	4.45	4.25	4.26	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	5	4	4	3.67	1199/1416	2.67	4.35	4.26	4.27	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	369/1199	4.40	4.07	3.97	4.02	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	804/1312	3.67	4.47	4.00	4.09	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	563/1303	4.25	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	570/1299	3.96	4.72	4.25	4.30	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	387/ 758	3.63	4.28	4.01	4.00	4.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 312 0201

ANALYSIS OF TCHNG & LR

Title

Instructor: KINACH, BARBARA Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 517 JUN 14, 2005 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														
	0	0	-	2	4	_	0	2 00	1442/1504	2 00	4 42	4 00	4 00	2 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	4		۷		1443/1504			4.27	4.27	3.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	4	1	1	1		1493/1503	2.94	4.34	4.20	4.22	2.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	2	3	3		1165/1290	3.45	4.56	4.28	4.31	3.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	3	2		1383/1453	3.43	4.43	4.21	4.23	3.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	4	1	1		1394/1421	2.70	4.31	4.00	4.01	2.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	3	2	1	2.64	1340/1365	2.99	4.38	4.08	4.08	2.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	3	4	1	0	2.27	1471/1485	2.90	4.33	4.16	4.17	2.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	3	3	2	1	3.11	1367/1483	3.37	4.18	4.06	4.08	3.11
T a set-con-														
Lecture	0	0	-1	-1	0	_	-	0 60	1404/1405	2 42	4 50	4 41	4 42	0 60
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	Ţ	1	0	0	1		1404/1425		4.50	4.41	4.43	2.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	1	0	1		1395/1426	4.03	4.80	4.69	4.71	3.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	1	0	1	1	0		1379/1418	3.43	4.45	4.25	4.26	2.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	1	0	0		1409/1416	2.67	4.35	4.26	4.27	1.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1199	4.40	4.07	3.97	4.02	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	5	2	2 //2	1047/1312	3.67	4.47	4.00	4.09	3.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	4	1	6	4.00	910/1303	4.25	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.00
		0	1	2	3	٦ _	2		1136/1299	3.96	4.72	4.25		3.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	4	Τ	Δ	2	2	2						4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	2	U	2	2	2	3.25	648/ 758	3.63	4.28	4.01	4.00	3.25

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Ĺ
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	5						

Course-Section: EDUC 317 0101

SMALL, SUE ELLE (Instr. A)

PROC & ACQUIS READ

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 518 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 8

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General		•		•	•	_	_	4 00	150/1504	4 00	4 40	4 00	4 0 0	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	/	4.88	153/1504		4.43	4.27	4.27	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	/ 3	4.88	125/1503 1/1290		4.34	4.20	4.22	4.88 5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5 0	0	0	0	1	3	4.88	118/1453		4.56 4.43	4.28	4.31	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.88	320/1421		4.43	4.21	4.23	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	451/1365	4.38	4.31	4.08	4.01	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	200/1485		4.33	4.16	4.17	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504		4.83	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1483		4.18	4.06	4.08	5.00
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	U	O	U	U	U	U	O	3.00	1/1403	3.00	4.10	4.00	1.00	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	224/1425	4.88	4.50	4.41	4.43	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.45	4.25	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.35	4.26	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	85/1199	4.88	4.07	3.97	4.02	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	196/1312		4.47	4.00	4.09	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	227/1303	4.88	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	233/1299	4.88	4.72	4.25	4.30	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	73/ 758	4.86	4.28	4.01	4.00	4.86
Seminar	_	0	_	0	0	0	-	F 00	****		4 4 1	4 61	4 0 4	***
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76		4.47	4.61	4.84	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7 7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76 ****/ 73		4.51	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	/	U	U	U	U	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	^ ^ ^ ^	4.18	4.17	4.25	^ ^ ^ ^
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	43/ 58	4.38	4.42	4.43	4.52	4.38
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	33/ 56		4.29	4.23	4.13	4.38
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	21/ 44		4.77	4.65	4.77	4.80
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	2	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	28/ 47	4.00	4.38	4.29	4.14	4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	17/ 39		4.57	4.44	4.47	4.67
Frequ	ıency	Dist	crib	utio	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	7	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sic	nificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-			

? 1

Course-Section: EDUC 317 0101

Title

PROC & ACOUIS READ

Instructor:

TILLES, ALYSON (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 12

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2005

Page 519

JUN 14, 2005

Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires: Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 4.88 153/1504 4.88 4.43 4.27 4.27 0 0 0 0 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 4.88 125/1503 4.88 4.34 4.20 4.22 Ω 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 5 0 0 3 5.00 1/1290 5.00 4.56 4.28 4.31 5.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals Ω Ω 0 4.88 118/1453 4.88 Ω 1 4.43 4.21 4.23 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 0 0 7 4.50 320/1421 4.50 4.31 4.00 4.01 4.50 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 0 1 6 4.38 451/1365 4.38 4.38 4.08 4.08 4.38 4.75 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 Ω 0 0 0 6 200/1485 4.75 4.33 4.16 4.17 4.75 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1504 4.83 4.69 4.65 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 Ω 8 5.00 1/1483 5.00 4.18 4.06 4.08 5.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 224/1425 4.88 4.50 4.41 4.43 4.88 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1426 5.00 4.80 4.69 4.71 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 Ω Ω 0 0 Ω 8 5.00 1/1418 5.00 4.45 4.25 4.26 5.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1416 5.00 4.35 4.26 4.27 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 7 4.88 85/1199 4.88 4.07 3.97 4.02 4.88 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 6 4.75 196/1312 4.75 4.47 4.00 4.09 Ω 0 0 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 4.88 227/1303 4.88 4.67 4.24 4.27 4.88 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 7 4.88 233/1299 4.88 4.72 4.25 4.30 4. Were special techniques successful 6 4.86 73/ 758 4.86 4.28 4.01 4.00 4.86 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.51 4.44 4.51 1 5.00 ****/ 73 **** 4.18 4.17 4.25 5. Were criteria for grading made clear Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 6 4.38 43/ 58 4.38 4.42 4.43 4.52 4.38 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 5 4.38 33/ 4.38 4.29 4.23 4.13 0 56 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 0 3 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 21/ 44 4.80 4.77 4.65 4.77 4.80 1 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 1 2 1 0 3 4.00 28/ 47 4.00 4.38 4.29 4.14 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 1 2 4.67 17/ 39 4.67 4.57 4.44 4.47 4.67 1 4 Ω Frequency Distribution C

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

? 1

Course-Section: EDUC 318 0101

INSTRUCTION OF READING

Instructor: CANTOR, RONNI

Enrollment: 9
Questionnaires: 8

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 520 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
	0	0	0	0	0	_	-1	2 62	1215/1504	2 62	4 42	4 00	4 00	2 62
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	5	Τ		1315/1504		4.43	4.27	4.27	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	2		1263/1503	3.63	4.34	4.20	4.22	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	4	2		1078/1290	3.75	4.56	4.28	4.31	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	3		1123/1453	3.88	4.43	4.21	4.23	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	1113/1421	3.50	4.31	4.00	4.01	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1003/1365	3.75	4.38	4.08	4.08	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	625/1485	4.38	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	3.50	1233/1483	3.50	4.18	4.06	4.08	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	Λ	1	1	2	2	3 83	1238/1425	3.83	4.50	4.41	4.43	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.67	967/1426		4.80	4.69	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	2	1		1250/1418	3.50	4.45	4.25	4.26	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	2	1		1248/1416	3.50	4.35	4.25	4.27	3.50
<u>-</u>	_	1	1	1	3	_	Τ		- ,					
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	Т	3	0	U	2.40	1153/1199	2.40	4.07	3.97	4.02	2.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	572/1312	4.29	4.47	4.00	4.09	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	776/1303	4.29	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	780/1299	4.29	4.72	4.25	4.30	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	4.28	4.01	4.00	4.00
-														

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

Course-Section: EDUC 319 0101
Title ASSESS READING
Instructor: BROOKS, WANDA

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 521 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 12
Questionnaires: 10 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	700/1504	4.40	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	795/1503	4.30	4.34	4.20	4.22	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1290	4.80	4.56	4.28	4.31	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	240/1453	4.70	4.43	4.21	4.23	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	863/1421	3.90	4.31	4.00	4.01	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	420/1365	4.40	4.38	4.08	4.08	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	98/1485	4.90	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	960/1504	4.70	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	793/1483	4.10	4.18	4.06	4.08	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	525/1425	4.70	4.50	4.41	4.43	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	926/1426	4.70	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	799/1418	4.30	4.45	4.25	4.26	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	525/1416	4.60	4.35	4.26	4.27	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	542/1199	4.20	4.07	3.97	4.02	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	444/1312	4.43	4.47	4.00	4.09	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	523/1303	4.57	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	395/1299	4.71	4.72	4.25	4.30	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	114/ 758	4.71	4.28	4.01	4.00	4.71

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

Course-Section: EDUC 320 0101 University of Maryland Page 522 Title TEACH MATH IN ELEM SCH Baltimore County JUN 14, 2005

TEACH MATH IN ELEM SCH BA

KINACH, BARBARA

Instructor: KINACH, BAF Enrollment: 13

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Spring 2005

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	5	3	1	3.00	1453/1504	3.00	4.43	4.27	4.27	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	5	3	2	0	2.42	1490/1503	2.42	4.34	4.20	4.22	2.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1210/1290	3.25	4.56	4.28	4.31	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	3	0	3.00	1404/1453	3.00	4.43	4.21	4.23	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	3	3	1	2.75	1368/1421	2.75	4.31	4.00	4.01	2.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	6	1	2	3.08	1287/1365	3.08	4.38	4.08	4.08	3.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	2	3	2	1	2.50	1452/1485	2.50	4.33	4.16	4.17	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	2	2	4	2	0	2.60	1439/1483	2.60	4.18	4.06	4.08	2.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	6	2	2	3.33	1070/1312	3.33	4.47	4.00	4.09	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	6	1	5	3.92	983/1303	3.92	4.67	4.24	4.27	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	3	2	3	3	1	2.75	1232/1299	2.75	4.72	4.25	4.30	2.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	1	2	6	2	3.58	561/ 758	3.58	4.28	4.01	4.00	3.58

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	5						

Course-Section: EDUC 324 0101

Title PROCESS SEM IN ECE-M/S

Instructor: DIECKMAN, DONNA

Enrollment: 9
Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 523 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	_	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	3	3	4.29	851/1504	4.29	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	618/1503	4.43	4.34	4.20	4.22	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.56	4.28	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	563/1453	4.43	4.43	4.21	4.23	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	642/1421	4.14	4.31	4.00	4.01	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	690/1365	4.14	4.38	4.08	4.08	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.33	4.16	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1047/1504	4.57	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.18	4.06	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	876/1425	4.43	4.50	4.41	4.43	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	620/1426	4.86	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	682/1418	4.43	4.45	4.25	4.26	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	554/1416	4.57	4.35	4.26	4.27	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	964/1199	3.40	4.07	3.97	4.02	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	364/1312	4.50	4.47	4.00	4.09	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 758	****	4.28	4.01	4.00	****
-														
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 76	****	4.47	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 70	****	4.06	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 76	****	4.51	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.18	4.17	4.25	***

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

Course-Section: EDUC 330 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County TCHNG SCIENCE: ELEM SCH

Title BLUNCK, SUSAN Spring 2005 Instructor:

Enrollment: 22

Questionnaires: 9

~	~			
Student	Collega	Evaluation	Ougetion	naire

Page 524

JUN 14, 2005

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	146/1504	4.89	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	119/1503	4.89	4.34	4.20	4.22	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	250/1290	4.75	4.56	4.28	4.31	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	112/1453	4.89	4.43	4.21	4.23	4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	283/1421	4.56	4.31	4.00	4.01	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.38	4.08	4.08	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.33	4.16	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	1294/1504	4.22	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	282/1483	4.57	4.18	4.06	4.08	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	121/1312	4.89	4.47	4.00	4.09	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	217/1303	4.89	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	223/1299	4.89	4.72	4.25	4.30	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	94/ 758	4.78	4.28	4.01	4.00	4.78

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0					_	
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	7	_			
				_	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 331 0101

SOCIAL STUDIES: ELEM SC

Instructor: FITZHUGH, WILLI

Enrollment: 5
Questionnaires: 5

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 525 JUN 14, 2005 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	Ο	0	5	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	171/1503	4.80	4.34	4.20	4.22	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.56	4.28	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	158/1453	4.80	4.43	4.21	4.23	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	127/1421	4.80	4.31	4.00	4.01	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	114/1365	4.80	4.38	4.08	4.08	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	349/1485	4.60	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1030/1504	4.60	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.18	4.06	4.08	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	331/1425	4.80	4.50	4.41	4.43	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.45	4.25	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.35	4.26	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	429/1199	4.33	4.07	3.97	4.02	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	Λ	E	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.47	4.00	4.09	5.00
-	-	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	299/1303	4.80	4.47	4.24	4.09	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4							
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	כ	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	U	U	U	U	Т	3	4.75	101/ 758	4.75	4.28	4.01	4.00	4.75
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	***	4.80	4.09	4.14	****

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

Course-Section: EDUC 351 0101

Title SOC, EMO, & ETHICAL DEV Y

Instructor: FRYER, MARY

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 526 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	10	4	3.94	1153/1504	3.94	4.43	4.27	4.27	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	8	3		1267/1503	3.61	4.34	4.20	4.22	3.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	1	1		****/1290	****	4.56	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	752/1453	4.28	4.43	4.21	4.23	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	5	7	4.06	712/1421	4.06	4.31	4.00	4.01	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	441/1365	4.39	4.38	4.08	4.08	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	5	3	1	7	3.33	1330/1485	3.33	4.33	4.16	4.17	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	3	6	6	0	3.20	1340/1483	3.20	4.18	4.06	4.08	3.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	5	8	2	3.69	1274/1425	3.69	4.50	4.41	4.43	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	15		351/1426	4.94	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	4	8	3		1209/1418	3.65	4.45	4.25	4.26	3.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	5	5	3.65	1205/1416	3.65	4.35	4.26	4.27	3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	3	4	5	1	3.00	1050/1199	3.00	4.07	3.97	4.02	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	290/1312	4.62	4.47	4.00	4.09	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	344/1303	4.77	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	162/1299	4.92	4.72	4.25	4.30	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	471/ 758	3.91	4.28	4.01	4.00	3.91
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	Ω	8	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.42	4.43	4.52	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	38/ 56	4.25	4.29	4.23	4.13	4.25
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 44	****	4.77	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	28/ 47	4.00	4.38	4.29	4.14	4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	27/ 39	4.29	4.57	4.44		4.29

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	 13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: EDUC 352 0101

PROCESS SEM ECE-MEDIA

Instructor: COSTELLO, MARGA

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 11

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 527 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Outstions	Questions			Fre	_	ncies	§ 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 0 2 8 8 4.55 495/1504 4.55 4.34 4.27 4.27 4.55	**************************************														
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 8. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 9. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 9. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assigned reading system clearly explained 9. Did written assigned produced to what you learned 9. Did written assigned the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 10. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10. Did class discussions contribute to the announced theme 10. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10. Did class	General														
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. O 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 0 4 6 4.45 365/1421 4.45 4.31 4.00 4.01 4.45 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. O 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 1 8 4.36 636/1485 4.36 4.33 4.16 4.17 4.36 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. O 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 1 8 4.36 635/1483 4.25 4.18 4.06 4.08 4.08 4.09 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 4.15 657/1504 4.91 4.83 4.69 4.65 4.91 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 4.15 657/1504 4.91 4.83 4.69 4.65 4.91 9. How the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the instructor seem interested and explained clearly 1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. O 0 0 0 1 1 4 5 4.63 283/1312 4.63 4.47 4.00 4.09 4.63 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4. O 0 0 0 1 0 6 4.71 395/1299 4.71 4.72 4.25 4.30 4.71 4. Were special techniques successful 2. Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 1. Did presentations contribute	1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	495/1504	4.55	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. O 0 1 1 0 1 1 8 4.36 636/1485 4.09 4.38 4.08 4.09 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. O 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 1 8 4.36 636/1485 4.36 4.33 4.16 4.17 4.36 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. O 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.18 1082/1425 4.18 4.06 4.08 4.25 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 9. O 0 1 0 0 1 1 3 6 4.18 1082/1425 4.18 4.06 4.08 4.25 Lecture 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 10. O 0 0 0 1 1 5 5 5 4.27 828/1418 4.27 4.45 4.25 4.26 4.27 10. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 10. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10. O 0 0 0 0 1 5 0 6 4.71 395/1299 4.71 4.72 4.25 4.25 4.26 10. Were special techniques enhance open discussion 11. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 14. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16. O 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** 17. Were assigned topics relevant to what you learned 18. How many times and the projects contribute to what you learned 19. O 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** 19. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10. O 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** 19. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10. O 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** 19. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10. O 0 0 0 0 0 1	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	-	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	572/1503	4.45	4.34	4.20	4.22	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 4 4 6 4.45 365/1421 4.45 4.31 4.00 4.01 4.45 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 2 3 5 4.09 731/1365 4.09 4.38 4.08 4.08 4.09 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 1 1 1 8 4.36 636/1485 4.36 4.37 4.16 4.17 4.36 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.91 657/1504 4.91 4.83 4.69 4.65 4.91 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 2 2 4 4.25 635/1483 4.25 4.18 4.06 4.08 4.25		0	10	•	-	•	1	0	4.00	****/1290	****	4.56			
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 2 2 3 5 4.09 731/1365 4.09 4.38 4.08 4.08 4.09 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 1 8 4.36 636/1485 4.36 4.36 4.37 4.36 4.91 4.83 4.16 4.17 4.36 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.91 657/1504 4.91 4.83 4.16 4.17 4.36 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 2 2 4 4.25 635/1483 4.25 4.18 4.06 4.08 4.25 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 1 0 1 3 6 4.18 1082/1425 4.18 4.50 4.41 4.43 4.18 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5 0 1/1426 5.00 4.80 4.69 4.71 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 0 5 5 4.27 828/1418 4.27 4.45 4.25 4.26 4.27 4.18 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 5 4.18 929/146 4.18 4.35 4.26 4.27 4.18 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 2 0 1 2 1 4 4.00 636/1199 4.00 4.07 3.97 4.02 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1303 5.00 4.67 4.24 4.27 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 1 0 6 4.71 395/1299 4.71 4.72 4.25 4.30 4.71 4. Were special techniques successful 4 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** 2.84 the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** 4.54 the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** 4.54 the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** 4.54 the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** 4.54 the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.44 4.45 4.45 **** 4.55 the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.44 4.45 4.45 **** 4.55 the instructor contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.44		0	_	•	_			3		- ,					
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 0 1 1 8 4.36 636/1485 4.36 4.33 4.16 4.17 4.36 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 10 4.91 657/1504 4.91 4.83 4.69 4.65 4.91 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 2 2 4 4.25 635/1483 4.25 4.18 4.06 4.08 4.25 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 1 0 1 3 6 4.18 1082/1425 4.18 4.50 4.41 4.43 4.18 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 1/1426 5.00 4.80 4.69 4.71 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 0 5 5 4.27 828/1418 4.27 4.45 4.25 4.26 4.27 4.18 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 2 0 1 2 1 4 4.00 636/1199 4.00 4.07 3.97 4.02 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 283/1312 4.63 4.47 4.00 4.09 4.63 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1303 5.00 4.67 4.24 4.27 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 1 0 6 4.71 395/1299 4.71 4.72 4.25 4.30 4.71 4. Were special techniques successful 4 0 0 0 0 1 0 6 4.71 395/1299 4.71 4.72 4.25 4.30 4.71 4. Were special techniques successful 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** 4.54 4.54 4.55 4.54 4.55 4.54 4.55 4.54 4.55 4.54 4.55 4.54 4.55 4			-	•	-			6						4.01	
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 2 2 4 4.25 635/1483 4.25 4.18 4.06 4.08 4.25 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Did the instructor seem interested and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Discussion 7. Discussion 8. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Were special techniques successful 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced them 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced them 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced them 1. Were assigned topics relevant to what you learned 1. Were criteria for grading made clear 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contribute to what you lear			-	-	_			5							
Lecture Lecture Le			-	_	-			-							
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Did significant to the announced theme 7. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 7. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 7. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 7. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 7. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 8. Were criteria for grading made clear 8. Were contribute to what you learned 9. O 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** 9. O 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** 9. O 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** 9. Were criteria for grading made clear 10. O 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** 10. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10. O 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** 10. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10. O 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** 10. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10. O 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.51 4.44 4.51 **** 10. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10. O 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.51 4.44 4.51 **** 10. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10. O 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.54 4.54 5.25 ****	<u>-</u>		-	-	-	-	_								
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 1 0 1 3 6 4.18 1082/1425 4.18 4.50 4.41 4.43 4.18 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 11 5.00 1/1426 5.00 4.80 4.69 4.71 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 0 5 5 4.27 828/1418 4.27 4.45 4.25 4.26 4.27 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 4 5 4.18 929/1416 4.18 4.35 4.26 4.27 4.18 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 2 0 1 2 1 4 4.00 636/1199 4.00 4.07 3.97 4.02 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 283/1312 4.63 4.47 4.00 4.09 4.63 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1303 5.00 4.67 4.24 4.27 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 1 0 6 4.71 395/1299 4.71 4.72 4.25 4.30 4.71 4. Were special techniques successful 4 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 73/758 4.86 4.28 4.01 4.00 4.86 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.32 4.34 3.98 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 73 **** 4.18 4.17 4.25 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 73 **** 4.48 4.17 4.25 ****	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	635/1483	4.25	4.18	4.06	4.08	4.25
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 1 0 1 3 6 4.18 1082/1425 4.18 4.50 4.41 4.43 4.18 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 11 5.00 1/1426 5.00 4.80 4.69 4.71 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 0 5 5 4.27 828/1418 4.27 4.45 4.25 4.26 4.27 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 4 5 4.18 929/1416 4.18 4.35 4.26 4.27 4.18 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 2 0 1 2 1 4 4.00 636/1199 4.00 4.07 3.97 4.02 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 283/1312 4.63 4.47 4.00 4.09 4.63 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1303 5.00 4.67 4.24 4.27 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 1 0 6 4.71 395/1299 4.71 4.72 4.25 4.30 4.71 4. Were special techniques successful 4 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 73/758 4.86 4.28 4.01 4.00 4.86 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.32 4.34 3.98 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 73 **** 4.18 4.17 4.25 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 73 **** 4.48 4.17 4.25 ****	Lagtura														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 11 5.00 1/1426 5.00 4.80 4.69 4.71 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 1 0 5 5 4.27 828/1418 4.27 4.45 4.25 4.26 4.27 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 1 4 5 4.18 929/1416 4.18 4.35 4.26 4.27 4.18 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 2 0 1 2 1 4 4.00 636/1199 4.00 4.07 3.97 4.02 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 283/1312 4.63 4.47 4.00 4.09 4.63 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1303 5.00 4.67 4.24 4.27 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 1 0 6 4.71 395/1299 4.71 4.72 4.25 4.30 4.71 4. Were special techniques successful 4 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 73/758 4.86 4.28 4.01 4.00 4.86 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 70 **** 4.32 4.34 3.98 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 73 *** 4.18 4.17 4.25 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 73 *** 4.18 4.17 4.25 ****		٥	0	1	Ο	1	3	6	4 18	1082/1425	4 18	4 50	4 41	4 43	4 18
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 0 5 5 4.27 828/1418 4.27 4.45 4.25 4.26 4.27 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 1 4 5 4.18 929/1416 4.18 4.35 4.26 4.27 4.18 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 2 0 1 2 1 4 4.00 636/1199 4.00 4.07 3.97 4.02 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 283/1312 4.63 4.47 4.00 4.09 4.63 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1303 5.00 4.67 4.24 4.27 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 1 0 6 4.71 395/1299 4.71 4.72 4.25 4.30 4.71 4. Were special techniques successful 4 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 73/758 4.86 4.28 4.01 4.00 4.86 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.06 4.35 4.24 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.32 4.34 3.98 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 78 **** 4.51 4.44 4.51 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 78 **** 4.18 4.17 4.25 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 78 **** 4.42 4.43 4.52 ****		·	-	0	O	0	0	-							
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 1 4 5 4.18 929/1416 4.18 4.35 4.26 4.27 4.18 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 2 0 1 2 1 4 4.00 636/1199 4.00 4.07 3.97 4.02 4.00 Discussion Discussion Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 283/1312 4.63 4.47 4.00 4.09 4.63 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1303 5.00 4.67 4.24 4.27 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 1 0 6 4.71 395/1299 4.71 4.72 4.25 4.30 4.71 4. Were special techniques successful 4 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 73/758 4.86 4.28 4.01 4.00 4.86 Seminar Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.32 4.34 3.98 **** Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 78 **** 4.51 4.44 4.51 **** Field Work Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 73 **** 4.18 4.17 4.25 ****			-	-	-	-	-			,					
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. 0 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 283/1312 4.63 4.47 4.00 4.09 4.63 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4. 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1303 5.00 4.67 4.24 4.27 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. 0 0 0 0 1 0 6 4.71 395/1299 4.71 4.72 4.25 4.30 4.71 4. Were special techniques successful Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.32 4.34 3.98 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 73 **** 4.18 4.17 4.25 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 73 **** 4.42 4.43 4.52 ****								5		,					
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 283/1312 4.63 4.47 4.00 4.09 4.63 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1303 5.00 4.67 4.24 4.27 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 1 0 6 4.71 395/1299 4.71 4.72 4.25 4.30 4.71 4. Were special techniques successful 4 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 73/758 4.86 4.28 4.01 4.00 4.86 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 70 **** 4.06 4.35 4.24 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 67 **** 4.32 4.34 3.98 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.51 4.44 4.51 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 73 **** 4.18 4.17 4.25 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 73 **** 4.18 4.17 4.25 ****	<u> -</u>	-		-			1	4							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 283/1312 4.63 4.47 4.00 4.09 4.63 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1303 5.00 4.67 4.24 4.27 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 1 0 6 4.71 395/1299 4.71 4.72 4.25 4.30 4.71 4. Were special techniques successful 4 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 73/758 4.86 4.28 4.01 4.00 4.86 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 70 **** 4.06 4.35 4.24 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 67 **** 4.32 4.34 3.98 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.51 4.44 4.51 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 73 **** 4.18 4.17 4.25 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 58 **** 4.42 4.43 4.52 ****															
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1303 5.00 4.67 4.24 4.27 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 1 0 6 4.71 395/1299 4.71 4.72 4.25 4.30 4.71 4. Were special techniques successful 4 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 73/758 4.86 4.28 4.01 4.00 4.86 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 70 **** 4.06 4.35 4.24 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 67 **** 4.32 4.34 3.98 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.51 4.44 4.51 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 73 **** 4.18 4.17 4.25 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 58 **** 4.42 4.43 4.52 ****	Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 1 0 6 4.71 395/1299 4.71 4.72 4.25 4.30 4.71 4. Were special techniques successful 4 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 73/758 4.86 4.28 4.01 4.00 4.86 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 70 **** 4.06 4.35 4.24 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 67 **** 4.32 4.34 3.98 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.51 4.44 4.51 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 73 **** 4.18 4.17 4.25 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 58 **** 4.42 4.43 4.52 ****		3	0	0	0	0	3	5		283/1312	4.63		4.00	4.09	4.63
## Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10		4	0	0	0		0	7	5.00				4.24	4.27	5.00
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	395/1299	4.71	4.72	4.25	4.30	4.71
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 70 **** 4.06 4.35 4.24 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 67 **** 4.32 4.34 3.98 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.51 4.44 4.51 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 73 **** 4.18 4.17 4.25 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 58 **** 4.42 4.43 4.52 ****	4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	73/ 758	4.86	4.28	4.01	4.00	4.86
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.47 4.61 4.84 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 70 **** 4.06 4.35 4.24 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 67 **** 4.32 4.34 3.98 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.51 4.44 4.51 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 73 **** 4.18 4.17 4.25 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 58 **** 4.42 4.43 4.52 ****	Quantum con														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 70 **** 4.06 4.35 4.24 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 67 **** 4.32 4.34 3.98 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.51 4.44 4.51 *** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 73 **** 4.18 4.17 4.25 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 58 **** 4.42 4.43 4.52 ****		1.0	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	++++/ 76	++++	4 47	1 (1	4 0 4	++++
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 67 **** 4.32 4.34 3.98 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.51 4.44 4.51 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 73 **** 4.18 4.17 4.25 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 58 **** 4.42 4.43 4.52 ****	9 -		-	•	-	•	0	1		,					
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 4.51 4.44 4.51 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 73 **** 4.18 4.17 4.25 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 58 **** 4.42 4.43 4.52 ****			-	-	-	-	-	1		,					
5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 73 **** 4.18 4.17 4.25 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 58 **** 4.42 4.43 4.52 ****			-	-	-	•	•	_		, -					
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 58 **** 4.42 4.43 4.52 ****	<u>-</u>		-	-	-	-	-	_		,					
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 58 **** 4.42 4.43 4.52 ****	5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	/ /3		4.10	4.1/	4.25	
	Field Work														
	1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.42	4.43	4.52	***
	<u>-</u>	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.29	4.23	4.13	****

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

Course-Section: EDUC 353 0101

Title MATERIALS FOR EARLY LI

Instructor: SCULLY, PAT

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 528 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	168/1504	4.85	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	219/1503	4.75	4.34	4.20	4.22	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1290	****	4.56	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	240/1453	4.70	4.43	4.21	4.23	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	410/1421	4.40	4.31	4.00	4.01	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	114/1365	4.80	4.38	4.08	4.08	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	260/1485	4.70	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	16	3	4.16	1345/1504	4.16	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.16
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	282/1483	4.57	4.18	4.06	4.08	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	665/1425	4.60	4.50	4.41	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	301/1426	4.95	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	390/1418	4.65	4.45	4.25	4.26	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	324/1416	4.75	4.35	4.26	4.27	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	0	1	4	1	3	3.67	860/1199	3.67	4.07	3.97	4.02	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	164/1312	4.80	4.47	4.00	4.09	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	132/ 758	4.67	4.28	4.01	4.00	4.67
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.42	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	4.29	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.77	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.38	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.57	4.44	4.47	****

Credits Ea	arned Cum. GPA			Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	16	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20	-		_	
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 387 0101

TUTORING AND LITERACY Instructor:

TAYLOR, JOBY B (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 7

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 529 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

~	~			
Student	('Ollrge	Evaluation	()llestionr	naire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	S 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	0	4	4 14	1010/1504	4.14	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	3		954/1503	4.14	4.34	4.20	4.22	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1		****/1290	****	4.56	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	0	4		1001/1453	4.00	4.43	4.21	4.23	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5		182/1421	4.71	4.31	4.00	4.01	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	245/1365	4.57	4.38	4.08	4.08	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	866/1485	4.17	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1255/1504	4.29	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1302/1483	3.57	4.18	4.06	4.08	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	Ο	4 00	1165/1425	3.63	4.50	4.41	4.43	3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0			****/1426	4.50	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1			****/1418	3.75	4.45	4.25	4.26	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1416	4.00	4.35	4.26		4.00
•														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	297/1312	4.60	4.47	4.00	4.09	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	833/1303	4.20	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	734/ 758	2.50	4.28	4.01	4.00	2.50
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	4.55	4.09	4.20	****
2. Note for provided with adolates basinground intermedial	Ū	ŭ	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	1.00	, 211		1.00	1.05	1.20	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.47	4.61	4.84	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 70	****	4.06	4.35	4.24	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 67	***	4.32	4.34	3.98	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 58	****	4.42	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 56	***	4.42	4.23	4.13	***
2. Dia 700 Cicarry unacrocana your evaluation criteria	J	U	_	U	U	U	U	1.00	, 50		1.29	1.23	4.13	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	4.26	4.53	4.74	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	0							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	4	Under-grad	7	Non-major	1	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough		

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	2	
?	0			

Course-Section: EDUC 387 0101

University of Maryland Baltimore County

TUTORING AND LITERACY

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Spring 2005

Page 530 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 7
Questionnaires: 7

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				_	ncies		_		tructor	Course	-		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	1010/1504	4.14	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	3		954/1503	4.14	4.34	4.20	4.22	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.56	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.43	4.21	4.23	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	182/1421	4.71	4.31	4.00	4.01	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	245/1365	4.57	4.38	4.08	4.08	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	866/1485	4.17	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1255/1504	4.29	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1093/1483	3.57	4.18	4.06	4.08	3.57
<u>. </u>														
Lecture	2	0	0	1	1	2	0	2 25	1246/1405	2 (2	4 50	4.41	4 42	2 (2
 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 	3	0	0	1 0	1 0	2 2	0		1346/1425 1128/1426	3.63 4.50	4.50 4.80	4.41	4.43 4.71	3.63 4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	1	1		1163/1418	3.75	4.45	4.09	4.71	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1			1029/1416	4.00	4.45	4.26	4.27	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	0	0	0			1050/1199	3.00	4.07	3.97		3.00
3. Dia addiovibuai teemiiqaeb emianee your anderbeanding	5	4	-	O	O	O	_	3.00	1030/1122	3.00	1.07	3.77	1.02	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	297/1312	4.60	4.47	4.00	4.09	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	833/1303	4.20	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	734/ 758	2.50	4.28	4.01	4.00	2.50
Laboratory	_	•		_	•	_	•	1 00			4	4 00	4 00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	4.55	4.09	4.20	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 76	****	4.47	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 70	****	4.06	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 67		4.32		3.98	****
o. Dia repeared projects conciliated to made you rearned	ŭ	ŭ	_	ŭ	Ü	ŭ	Ü		,		1.52		3.70	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.42	4.43	4.52	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 56	****	4.29	4.23	4.13	****
2.16														
Self Paced	_	^	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	++++/ 40	****	4 26	4 52	4 74	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	Τ	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	^ ^ ^ *	4.26	4.53	4./4	
Frequ	encv	Dist	tribu	utio	ı									
	2			-										

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А б	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	в 0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	4	Under-grad	7	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3 00-3 49	2	D 0						

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough
				P	0			responses to be significant
				I	0	Other	2	
				2	0			

Course-Section: EDUC 388 0101

INCLUSION & INSTRUCTIO

Instructor: BERGE, NANCY B

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 25

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 531 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				_	ncies	3	_		ructor	Course	-		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	21	4.72	306/1504	4.72	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	19	4.68	301/1503		4.34	4.20	4.22	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	17	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	440/1290		4.56	4.28	4.31	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	112/1453		4.43	4.21	4.23	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	17	4.52	305/1421	4.52	4.31	4.00	4.01	4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	211/1365	4.63	4.38	4.08	4.08	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	7	18	4.72	240/1485	4.72	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	329/1504	4.96	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	322/1483	4.52	4.18	4.06	4.08	4.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	224/1425		4.50	4.41	4.43	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	667/1426		4.80	4.69	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	171/1418	4.83	4.45	4.25	4.26	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	175/1416		4.35	4.26	4.27	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	5	6	11	4.13	580/1199	4.13	4.07	3.97	4.02	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	142/1312	4.84	4.47	4.00	4.09	4.84
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	321/1303		4.67	4.24	4.27	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	263/1299		4.72	4.25	4.30	4.84
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	1	1	2	4	11	4.21	319/ 758		4.28	4.01	4.00	4.21
	-		_	_	_	_			,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.47	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	***	4.06	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.51	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.18	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work		_	_	_	_	_	_							
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	1	2	0	1	2.50	,	****	4.42	4.43	4.52	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	1	0	1	4		****/ 56		4.29	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	4	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 44	****	4.77	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	3	U	U	U	0	3	5.00	****/ 47	***	4.38	4.29	4.14	***

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	25	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	1
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	

I 0 Other 25 ? 0

Course-Section: EDUC 403 0101

ELEM INTRNSHP SEMINAR

Instructor: SMITH, DONALD

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 9

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 532 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncies	;		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	-	0	-	0	_	4 11	1020/1504	4 11	4 42	4 05	4 22	4 11
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	2	5		1038/1504		4.43	4.27	4.33	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1503		4.34	4.20	4.18	5.00 ***
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7 1	0	0	0	0	2		****/1290		4.56	4.28	4.32	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1 1	7	4.88	118/1453 370/1365		4.43	4.21	4.22	4.88 4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	4.44			4.38			5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	9 7	4.78	1/1485 866/1504		4.83	$4.16 \\ 4.69$	4.14 4.73	4.78
<u>.</u>	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.78	211/1483		4.83	4.09		4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	U	U	U	U	۷	4	4.67	211/1483	4.67	4.18	4.06	4.11	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	209/1425	4.89	4.50	4.41	4.38	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.45	4.25	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	164/1416	4.89	4.35	4.26	4.26	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1199	****	4.07	3.97	4.05	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1312		4.47	4.00	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	356/1303	4.75	4.67	4.24	4.34	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1299		4.72	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 758	***	4.28	4.01	4.17	****
T albana kanna														
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 207	****	4.80	4.09	3.69	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	U	U	U	Т	U	U	3.00	/ 207		4.00	4.09	3.09	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.47	4.61	4.63	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	30/ 70	4.75	4.06	4.35	4.63	4.75
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	4.32	4.34	4.34	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 76		4.51	4.44	4.51	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 73			4.17	4.29	5.00
S S														
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 58		4.42	4.43	4.83	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 56	5.00	4.29	4.23	4.37	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.77	4.65	4.33	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.38	4.29	4.12	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	***	4.57	4.44	4.19	****

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Gra	ades Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А 6	Required for Maj	jors 0	Graduate	0	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	9	Non-major	3

84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough
				P	0			responses to be significant
				I	0	Other	8	
				?	0			

Course-Section: EDUC 408 0101 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County SCNDRY INTRNSHP SEMINA Spring 2005

Instructor: JEFFERSON, CHER

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 533 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	0	1	2		1.0	4 00	064/1504	4 00	4 42	4 00	4 22	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	864/1504	4.28	4.43	4.27	4.33	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	14	4.67	312/1503	4.67	4.34	4.20	4.18	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	0	0	1		****/1290	****	4.56	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	118/1453	4.88	4.43	4.21	4.22	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	-	0	3	/	8	4.28	532/1421	4.28	4.31	4.00	4.02	4.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	237/1365	4.59	4.38	4.08	4.09	4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	290/1485	4.67	4.33	4.16	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	9		1087/1504	4.50	4.83	4.69	4.73	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	173/1483	4.71	4.18	4.06	4.11	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	143/1425	4.93	4.50	4.41	4.38	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	351/1426	4.93	4.80	4.69	4.72	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	101/1418	4.93	4.45	4.25	4.25	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	380/1416	4.71	4.35	4.26	4.26	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	8	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	271/1199	4.50	4.07	3.97	4.05	4.50
o. Dia addiovidual occimination of four analysistanding	-	ŭ	ŭ	Ü	ŭ			1.55	_,_,	1.50	1.07	3.37	1.00	1.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	176/1312	4.79	4.47	4.00	4.07	4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	157/1303	4.93	4.67	4.24	4.34	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	143/ 758	4.64	4.28	4.01	4.17	4.64
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	1	Λ	4 00	****/ 233	****	4.67	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 244	***	4.55	4.09	3.56	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 227	****	4.55	4.40	4.16	****
-	17	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 225	****	4.83		3.81	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance		0	0	0	0		-			***		4.23		****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	U	U	U	U	1	0	4.00	****/ 207	^ ^ ^ ^	4.80	4.09	3.69	^ ^ ^ ^
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	26/ 76	4.94	4.47	4.61	4.63	4.94
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	4	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	21/ 70	4.92	4.06	4.35	4.63	4.92
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	5	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	45/ 67	4.27	4.32	4.34	4.34	4.27
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	0	2	12	4.50	46/ 76	4.50	4.51	4.44	4.51	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	30/ 73	4.53	4.18	4.17	4.29	4.53
Field Work	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	26/ 52	4 00	4 40	4 42	4 03	4 00
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	26/ 58	4.89	4.42	4.43	4.83	4.89
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	36/ 56	4.33	4.29	4.23	4.37	4.33
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.77	4.65	4.33	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	18/ 47	4.75	4.38	4.29	4.12	4.75
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	2	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	27/ 39	4.29	4.57	4.44	4.19	4.29

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sid	nificant	
				I	0	Other	16	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 410 0101 Title

READ CONTNT AREA I

COWAN, CHARISSE

Instructor: Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 534 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	-	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	119/1503	4.89	4.34	4.20	4.18	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.56	4.28	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	112/1453	4.89	4.43	4.21	4.22	4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.31	4.00	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	94/1365	4.88	4.38	4.08	4.09	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	113/1485	4.88	4.33	4.16	4.14	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	211/1483	4.67	4.18	4.06	4.11	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.50	4.41	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.45	4.25	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.35	4.26	4.26	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.07	3.97	4.05	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	196/1312	4.75	4.47	4.00	4.07	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	***	4.28	4.01	4.17	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.42	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.29	4.23	4.37	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 44	****	4.77	4.65	4.33	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.38	4.29	4.12	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	***	4.57	4.44	4.19	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.26	4.53	5.00	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.30	4.49	4.50	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	25/ 36	4.67	4.69	4.60	4.83	4.67
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 20	****	3.04	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.48	4.51	****	***

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ī

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	9	
?	0			

Course-Section: EDUC 414 0101

ADOLESCENT LITERATURE

NEUTZE, DONNA L

Instructor: NEUT
Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 15

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 535 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fr	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Instructor Mean Rank		Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	3		4.53	509/1504	4.53	4.43	4.27	4.33	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	312/1503	4.67	4.34	4.20	4.18	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	344/1290	4.67	4.56	4.28	4.32	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	270/1453	4.67	4.43	4.21	4.22	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	14	4.80	127/1421	4.80	4.31	4.00	4.02	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	274/1365	4.53	4.38	4.08	4.09	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	1	11	4.33	670/1485	4.33	4.33	4.16	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.18	4.06	4.11	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	270/1425	4.85	4.50	4.41	4.38	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.41	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92		4.92	4.45	4.25	4.25	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	310/1416	4.77	4.35	4.26	4.26	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	5	2		3.91						3.91
3. Did addiovisual teeliniques cimanee your understanding	2	2	U	U	5	2	-	3.71	740/1100	3.71	4.07	3.77	1.05	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	189/1312	4.77	4.47	4.00	4.07	4.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	101/ 758	4.75	4.28	4.01	4.17	4.75
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	4.55	4.09	3.56	***
Seminar		_		_	_									
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.47	4.61	4.63	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 76		4.51	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.18	4.17	4.29	***
mini di manda														
Field Work	1 1	0	-1	^	^	0	0	1 00	**** / EO		4 40	4 42	4 02	***
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1 1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.42	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	U	Т	U	U	0	0	1.00	****/ 56		4.29	4.23	4.37	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	4.26	4.53	5.00	****
1. Dia bell pacea bybeck conclibate to what you reallied		O	_	J	J	J	J	1.00	, 40		1.20	1.55	5.00	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	0
84-150	5	3 00-3 49	5	D 0						

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough
				P	0			responses to be significant
				I	0	Other	11	
				3	0			

Course-Section: EDUC 415 0101

MATERIALS TCH READ

Instructor: Young, Patricia Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 22

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 536 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			Fre	-	ncies 3	1	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean			Sect Mean
Quescions	NR	NA						Mean	Ralik		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	429/1504	4.59	4.43	4.27	4.33	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	346/1503		4.34	4.20	4.18	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1290	****	4.56	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	215/1453	4.73	4.43	4.21	4.22	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	6	14	4.41	410/1421	4.41	4.31	4.00	4.02	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	205/1365	4.64	4.38	4.08	4.09	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	3	15	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.33	4.16	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	4	3	10	4.22	668/1483	4.22	4.18	4.06	4.11	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	618/1425		4.50	4.41	4.38	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	620/1426	4.86	4.80	4.69	4.72	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	2	15	4.52	552/1418	4.52	4.45	4.25	4.25	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	2	15	4.48	662/1416		4.35	4.26	4.26	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	1	5	13	4.38	386/1199	4.38	4.07	3.97	4.05	4.38
Discussion	_		•	•	_	_		4 40	444/1010	4 40	4 45	4 00	4 0 0	4 40
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	444/1312		4.47	4.00	4.07	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	0	Ţ	16	4.63	478/1303		4.67	4.24	4.34	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0 1	0	1 0	1	3	14	4.58	523/1299		4.72	4.25	4.38	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	3	Т	0	U	2	1	15	4.72	111/ 758	4.72	4.28	4.01	4.17	4.72
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	Λ	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.42	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 56		4.42	4.23	4.37	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 44		4.77	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 47	****	4.38	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39		4.57	4.44	4.19	****
J. Did conferences help you early out field decivities	21	O	O	O	U	O	_	3.00	, 35		1.57	1.11	1.10	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.26	4.53	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.30	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36		4.69	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	3.04	4.24	****	****
5														

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	17	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	

I 0 Other 20 ? 0

Course-Section: EDUC 601 0201

HUMAN LEARNING/COGNITI

Instructor: OLIVA, LINDA M.

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 8

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 537
JUN 14, 2005
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies						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	2	3	3	4.13	1029/1504	4.13	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1150/1503	3.88	4.34	4.20	4.28	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	937/1290	4.00	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1191/1453	3.75	4.43	4.21	4.34	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	660/1421	4.13	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	708/1365	4.13	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	0	5	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	708/1504	4.88	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	1233/1483	3.50	4.18	4.06	4.20	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	1117/1425	4.13	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1212/1426	4.38	4.80	4.69	4.80	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1110/1418	3.88	4.45	4.25	4.36	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1112/1416	3.88	4.35	4.26	4.38	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	0	2	4	3.75	820/1199	3.75	4.07	3.97	4.04	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	902/1312	3.75	4.47	4.00	4.31	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	2	2	3		1004/1303	3.88	4.67	4.24	4.58	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	798/1299	4.25	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	630/ 758		4.28	4.01		3.33
Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.57	4.44	4.55	****
J. Dia conferences help you carry out field activities	,	U	J		3	J	U	2.00	, 55		1.57	1.11	1.33	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	A	 5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	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	3	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Ĺ
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				2	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 601E 0101

Title

Instructor: FRYER, MARY

Enrollment: 4
Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 538 JUN 14, 2005 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	•	•	•	•	•	-	_	4 55	0.60/1.504	4 55	4 40	4 0 0		4 55
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1504		4.43	4.27	4.44	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	848/1503	4.25	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.56	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	745/1421	4.00	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	3	4.75	139/1365	4.75	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	1		1176/1485	3.75	4.33	4.16	4.24	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1379/1483	3.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	1036/1425	4.25	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	871/1416	4.25	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1050/1199	3.00	4.07	3.97	4.04	3.00
Discussion		_	_		_									
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	947/1312		4.47	4.00	4.31	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	4.28	4.01	4.24	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.42	4.43	4.31	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	40/ 56	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.26	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	39/ 44	4.00	4.77	4.65	4.74	4.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	40/ 47	3.50	4.38	4.29	4.41	3.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	37/ 39	3.00	4.57	4.44	4.55	3.00
The state of the s	_	ŭ	_	ŭ	•	•	_	3.00	3., 35	3.00	,		1.00	3.00

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

Course-Section: EDUC 602 0101 University of Maryland Title INSTRUCTIONAL SYS DEV

WILLIAMS, VICKI

Instructor:

Baltimore County JUN 14, 2005 Spring 2005 Job IRBR3029

Page 539

	··· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1 5
Enrollment:	2	
Ouestionnaires:	1	Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

	Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	4.59	4.43	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	4.10	4.34	4.20	4.28	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1453	4.43	4.43	4.21	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.37	4.31	4.00	4.27	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1365	4.51	4.38	4.08	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1485	4.39	4.33	4.16	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	4.98	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	4.53	4.50	4.41	4.51	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1418	4.43	4.45	4.25	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1416	4.10	4.35	4.26	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1199	3.67	4.07	3.97	4.04	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	716/1312	4.08	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1195/1303	4.01	4.67	4.24	4.58	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1299	4.83	4.72	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	680/ 758	3.71	4.28	4.01	4.24	3.00

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

Course-Section: EDUC 602 0201

INSTRUCTIONAL SYS DEV

Title Instructor: KINACH, BARBARA

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 540 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies				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	3	1	4.25	889/1504	4.59	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	1485/1503	4.10	4.34	4.20	4.28	2.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1261/1290	3.88	4.56	4.28	4.36	2.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1282/1453	4.43	4.43	4.21	4.34	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1113/1421	4.37	4.31	4.00	4.27	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1003/1365	4.51	4.38	4.08	4.35	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1348/1485	4.39	4.33	4.16	4.24	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	4.98	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	1423/1483	3.63	4.18	4.06	4.20	2.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1165/1425	4.53	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1319/1426	4.47	4.80	4.69	4.80	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1250/1418	4.43	4.45	4.25	4.36	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1378/1416	4.10	4.35	4.26	4.38	2.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1190/1199	3.67	4.07	3.97	4.04	1.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3 50	1011/1312	4.08	4.47	4.00	4.31	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	563/1303	4.01	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	570/1299	4.83	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	304/ 758	3.71	4.28	4.01	4.24	4.25

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

Course-Section: EDUC 602 8010

Title INSTRUCTIONAL SYS DEV

Instructor: HODELL, CHARLES

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 541 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	1				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	5	9	4.53	509/1504	4.59	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	171/1503	4.10	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1290	3.88	4.56	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	158/1453	4.43	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	241/1421	4.37	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	124/1365	4.51	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	78/1485	4.39	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	525/1504	4.98	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	338/1483	3.63	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	665/1425	4.53	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	351/1426	4.47	4.80	4.69	4.80	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	191/1418	4.43	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	255/1416	4.10	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	271/1199		4.07	3.97	4.04	4.50
Discussion	^	0	0	_	_			4 50	000/1010	4 00	4 4 17	4 00	4 21	4 50
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	208/1312		4.47	4.00	4.31	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	3	Τ	11	4.53	546/1303	4.01	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1299	4.83	4.72	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	Τ	2	2	3	./	3.87	481/ 758	3.71	4.28	4.01	4.24	3.87
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.55	4.09	4.09	****

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	5 5	0.00-0.99	5	 А	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	9	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	6	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_			
				2	0						

Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 542

University of Maryland Title THE ADULT LEARNER JUN 14, 2005 WILLIAMS, GREGO (Instr. A) Job IRBR3029 Instructor:

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 1092/1504 4.00 4.43 4.27 4.44 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 0 1 5.00 1/1290 5.00 4.56 4.28 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 3.67 1229/1453 3.67 4.43 4.21 4.34 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 782/1365 4.00 4.38 4.08 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 1379/1483 4.00 4.18 4.06 4.20 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	l Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 1092/1504 4.00 4.43 4.27 4.44 2.00 1092/1504 4.00 4.43 4.27 4.44 2.00 1092/1504 4.00 4.43 4.27 4.44 2.00 1092/1504 4.00 4.43 4.27 4.44 2.00 1092/1504 4.00 4.43 4.27 4.44 2.00 1092/1504 4.00 4.43 4.27 4.44 2.00 1092/1504 4.00 4.43 4.27 4.44 2.00 1092/1504 4.00 4.43 4.27 4.44 2.00 1092/1504 4.00 4.28 4.28 4.36 4.00 4.00 4.28 4.36 4.00 4.28 4.36 4.00 4.28 4.36 4.00 4.28 4.36 4.00 4.28 4.36 4.00 4.28 4.36 4.00 4.28 4.36 4.00 4.28 4.38 4.39 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30	n Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 1092/1504 4.00 4.43 4.27 4.44 2.00 1092/1504 4.00 4.43 4.27 4.44 2.00 1092/1504 4.00 4.43 4.27 4.44 2.00 1092/1504 4.00 4.43 4.27 4.44 2.00 1092/1504 4.00 4.43 4.27 4.44 2.00 1092/1504 4.00 4.43 4.27 4.44 2.00 1092/1504 4.00 4.43 4.27 4.44 2.00 1092/1504 4.00 4.43 4.27 4.44 2.00 1092/1504 4.00 4.28 4.28 4.36 4.00 4.00 4.28 4.36 4.00 4.28 4.36 4.00 4.28 4.36 4.00 4.28 4.36 4.00 4.28 4.36 4.00 4.28 4.36 4.00 4.28 4.36 4.00 4.28 4.38 4.39 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 0 2 0 3.33 1365/1503 3.33 4.34 4.20 4.28 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 2 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1290 5.00 4.56 4.28 4.36 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 3.67 1229/1453 3.67 4.43 4.21 4.34 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 479/1421 4.33 4.31 4.00 4.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 782/1365 4.00 4.38 4.08 4.35 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 3.67 1222/1485 3.67 4.33 4.16 4.24 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 10 1 1504 5.00 4.83 4.69 4.79	4 4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 2 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1290 5.00 4.56 4.28 4.36 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 3.67 1229/1453 3.67 4.43 4.21 4.34 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 479/1421 4.33 4.31 4.00 4.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 782/1365 4.00 4.38 4.08 4.35 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 3.67 1222/1485 3.67 4.33 4.16 4.24 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1504 5.00 4.83 4.69 4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 3.67 1229/1453 3.67 4.43 4.21 4.34 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 479/1421 4.33 4.31 4.00 4.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 782/1365 4.00 4.38 4.08 4.35 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 3.67 1222/1485 3.67 4.33 4.16 4.24 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1504 5.00 4.83 4.69 4.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 479/1421 4.33 4.31 4.00 4.27 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 782/1365 4.00 4.38 4.08 4.35 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 3.67 1222/1485 3.67 4.33 4.16 4.24 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1504 5.00 4.83 4.69 4.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 782/1365 4.00 4.38 4.08 4.35 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 3.67 1222/1485 3.67 4.33 4.16 4.24 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1504 5.00 4.83 4.69 4.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 3.67 1222/1485 3.67 4.33 4.16 4.24 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1504 5.00 4.83 4.69 4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1504 5.00 4.83 4.69 4.79	
**	
7. Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 13/9/1103 4.00 4.10 4.00 4.20	
Lecture	
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 2 1 0 3.33 1334/1425 3.33 4.50 4.41 4.51	1 3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 1232/1426 4.33 4.80 4.69 4.80	0 4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 1330/1418 3.00 4.45 4.25 4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 1412/1416 1.00 4.35 4.26 4.38	8 1.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 1138/1199 2.50 4.07 3.97 4.04	4 2.50
Discussion	
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 255/1312 4.67 4.47 4.00 4.31	1 4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1303 5.00 4.67 4.24 4.58	8 5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1299 5.00 4.72 4.25 4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful 0 2 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/758 5.00 4.28 4.01 4.24	4 5.00
Seminar	
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme $$ 2 $$ 0 $$ 1 $$ 0 $$ 3.00 $$ 71/ 76 3.00 $$ 4.47 4.61 $$ 4.57	7 3.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 2 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 68/ 70 1.00 4.06 4.35 4.21	1 1.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 0 0 2.00 65/ 67 2.00 4.32 4.34 4.48	8 2.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 58/ 76 4.00 4.51 4.44 4.39	9 4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear 1 0 0 2 0 0 0 2.00 71/ 73 2.00 4.18 4.17 4.19	5 2.00
Field Work	
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 56/ 58 2.00 4.42 4.43 4.31	1 2.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 2 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 52/ 56 2.00 4.29 4.23 4.26	6 2.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 2 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 43/ 47 3.00 4.38 4.29 4.41	1 3.00
Self Paced	
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 37/ 40 3.00 4.26 4.53 4.35	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 2 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 31/ 35 3.00 4.30 4.49 4.46	5 3.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 2 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 18/ 20 1.00 3.04 4.24 3.16	5 1.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Major	îs.
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						

56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	2	Under-grad 2 Non-major 2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough
				P	0			responses to be significant
				I	0	Other	1	
				3	0			

Course-Section: EDUC 605 8030 Title

THE ADULT LEARNER

(Instr. B)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 543 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 3

Instructor:

56-83

84-150

Grad.

0

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

0

0

С

D F

Ι

0

0

0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	MD	NA	Fr 1	eque: 2	ncies 3	3	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		se Dept n Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
Questions														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1092/150	4 4.0	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1365/150	3 3.3	3 4.34	4.20	4.28	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/129	0 5.0	4.56	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1229/14	3.6		4.21	4.34	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	479/142			4.00	4.27	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	782/13			4.08	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	1		1222/148			4.16	4.24	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/150			4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/148	3 4.0	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	255/13	2 4.6	7 4.47	4.00	4.31	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/130			4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/129	9 5.0	4.72	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 7!	8 5.0	4.28	4.01	4.24	5.00
Seminar	_		_	_		_	_							
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,	6 3.0		4.61		3.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00		0 1.0		4.35	4.21	1.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	,	7 2.0		4.34	4.48	2.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2 1	0 0	0	0 2	0	1	0	4.00	,	6 4.0		4.44	4.39	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	U	U	۷	U	U	U	2.00	71/ '	3 2.0	0 4.18	4.17	4.15	2.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	56/ !	8 2.0	4.42	4.43	4.31	2.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	52/ !	6 2.0	4.29	4.23	4.26	2.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	43/	7 3.0	4.38	4.29	4.41	3.00
Galf David														
Self Paced	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	27/	0 2 0	1 1 1 1	4 52	4 27	2 00
 Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned Did study questions make clear the expected goal 	2	0	0	0	1 1	0	0	3.00	- ,	0 3.0		4.53	4.37	3.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	3.00	- ,	5 3.0 0 1.0		4.49 4.24	4.46 3.16	3.00 1.00
4. was the reeuback/tutoring by proctors herpful	۷	U		U	U	U	U	1.00	10/	.0 1.0	3.04	4.24	3.10	1.00
Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	3				'ype			Majors	
						. – – – .								
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Gradua	ite	1	Majo	or	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0														

General

Other

Electives

2

0

1

Under-grad

2

responses to be significant

- Means there are not enough

Non-major

2

Course-Section: EDUC 605 8030 Title

THE ADULT LEARNER

(Instr. C)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 544 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 3

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				_	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4 00	1092/1504	4.00	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	0		1365/1503		4.34	4.20	4.28	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1		1/1290		4.56	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1			1229/1453		4.43	4.21	4.34	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.33			4.31	4.00	4.27	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1		4.00	782/1365		4.38	4.08	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1222/1485			4.16	4.24	3.6
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504		4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1483			4.06		4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	255/1312	4.67	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.58	5.0
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.56	5.0
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.28	4.01	4.24	5.0
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	71/ 76	3.00	4.47	4.61	4.57	3.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	68/ 70	1.00	4.06	4.35	4.21	1.0
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	65/ 67	2.00	4.32	4.34	4.48	2.0
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	58/ 76	4.00	4.51	4.44	4.39	4.0
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	71/ 73	2.00	4.18	4.17	4.15	2.0
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	56/ 58	2.00	4.42	4.43	4.31	2.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	52/ 56	2.00	4.29	4.23	4.26	2.0
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	43/ 47	3.00	4.38	4.29	4.41	3.0
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	37/ 40	3.00	4.26	4.53	4.37	3.0
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	31/ 35	3.00	4.30	4.49	4.46	3.0
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	18/ 20	1.00	3.04	4.24	3.16	1.00
Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			ТΣ	рe			Majors	.
00-27 0 0 00-0 99 0 A 3					or Ma	ior		·	Graduat		1	Maic		

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

Course-Section: EDUC 607 0101

PROCESSES & ACQ READIN

SMALL, SUE ELLE (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 545 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 8

Instructor:

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	168/1504	4.86	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	414/1503	4.57	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1290		4.56	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	,	4.57	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	115/1421	4.83	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	187/1365	4.67	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	134/1485	4.83	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	108/1483	4.92	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	255/1425	4.93	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.45	4.25	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	198/1416	4.83	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	213/1199	4.80	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	137/1312	4.86	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	132/ 758			4.01		
Cominan														
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.47	4.61	4 57	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6 7	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 76 ****/ 70	****	4.47	4.35	4.57 4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 76	****	4.51	4.35	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 73	****	4.18	4.17	4.15	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	34/ 58	4.75	4.42	4.43	4.31	4.75
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 56	5.00	4.29	4.23	4.26	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.77	4.65	4.74	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	20/ 47	4.67	4.38	4.29	4.41	4.67
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.57	4.44	4.55	5.00
Frem	an as	Diet	-rih	1+ i 01	า									

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

I 0 Other 6 ?

Course-Section: EDUC 607 0101

PROCESSES & ACQ READIN TILLES, ALYSON (Instr. B) University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 546 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 8

Instructor:

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			Fro	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	168/1504	4.86	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	414/1503		4.34	4.20	4.28	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1290		4.56	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	363/1453		4.43	4.21	4.34	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	115/1421		4.31	4.00	4.27	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	187/1365	4.67	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	134/1485	4.83	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1483	4.92	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1425	4.93	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426		4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1418		4.45	4.25	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	255/1416		4.35	4.26	4.38	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1199	4.80	4.07	3.97		4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	137/1312	4.86	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1303		4.67	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1299		4.72	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	132/ 758		4.28	4.01	4.24	4.67
IN HOLO SPOOLAL COOMILAGOS SACCOSSIAI	_	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	-	1.07	132, ,30	2.07	1120	1.01		1.07
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 76		4.47	4.61	4.57	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 70		4.06	4.35	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 76		4.51	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	***	4.18	4.17	4.15	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	34/ 58	4.75	4.42	4.43	4.31	4.75
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 56	5.00	4.29	4.23	4.26	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.77	4.65	4.74	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	20/ 47	4.67	4.38	4.29	4.41	4.67
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.57	4.44	4.55	5.00
Frequ	lency	Dist	crib	utio	n									

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

I 0 Other 6 ?

Course-Section: EDUC 608 0101
Title INSTRUCT READING

Title INSTRUCT READI Instructor: CANTOR, RONNI

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 547 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies								tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	991/1504	4.17	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1168/1503	3.83	4.34	4.20	4.28	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	711/1290	4.33	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1229/1453	3.67	4.43	4.21	4.34	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	623/1421	4.17	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	967/1365	3.80	4.38	4.08	4.35	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	866/1485	4.17	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	1302/1483	3.33	4.18	4.06	4.20	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1094/1425	4.17	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	667/1426	4.83	4.80	4.69	4.80	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	930/1418	4.17	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	806/1416	4.33	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1050/1199	3.00	4.07	3.97	4.04	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	651/1312	4.17	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	741/1299	4.33	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	328/ 758	4.20	4.28	4.01	4.24	4.20
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	40/ 58	4.50	4.42	4.43	4.31	4.50
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 56	5.00	4.29	4.23	4.26	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.77	4.65	4.74	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	1	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	4.38	4.29	4.41	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.57	4.44	4.55	****
			-	-	-	-			,			- -		

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

Course-Section: EDUC 610 8010
Title PRIN OF CBT/WBT
Instructor: WALSH, GREGORY

7

Enrollment:

Grad.

3.50-4.00

Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 548 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fr	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	. – – – – –															
1 Did 10	u gain na	Genera w insights,ski		m this sourse	0	0	0	0	0	2	_	4.71	306/1504	1 71	1 12	4.27	4.44	4.71
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.71	816/1503		4.43	4.20	4.28	4.71
		lestions reflec			0	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.29	344/1290		4.54	4.20	4.28	4.29
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.43	563/1453		4.43	4.20	4.34	4.67
					·	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.43	524/1421	4.43	4.43	4.21	4.27	4.43
				what you learned o what you learned	0 1	2	0	1	0	1	2	4.29	782/1365		4.31	4.00	4.27	4.29
		_		-		0	0	0	1	4	_							
	-	g system clearl		inea	0	-	0	0	0		2 6	4.14	,		4.33	4.16	4.24	4.14
		was class cand		1.' 55'	0	0	•	-	-	1	•	4.86	743/1504		4.83	4.69	4.79	4.86
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ıll teac	hing effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	700/1483	4.20	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.20
		Lectur	re .															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1105/1425	4.14	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.14
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	947/1418	4.14	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.14
	d the lectures contribute to what you learned				0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	845/1416		4.35	4.26	4.38	4.29
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand				0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	230/1199		4.07	3.97	4.04	
		Discus																
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	, -		4.47	4.00		4.43
		_	_	d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	401/1303		4.67	4.24	4.58	4.71
				d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	,		4.72	4.25	4.56	
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	essful		0	2	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	557/ 758	3.60	4.28	4.01	4.24	3.60
		Labora	torv															
1. Did th	ne lab ind	crease understa	-	f the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.67	4.09	4.56	****
			_	ground information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 244	****	4.55	4.09	4.09	****
				or lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 227	****	4.69	4.40	4.66	****
		structor provid			6	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 225	****	4.83	4.23	4.69	****
				early specified	6	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 207	****	4.80	4.09	4.40	****
	_	_																
	F						trib	ution	n									
Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gr							Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	7-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 5					Red		ed fo	or Ma	ajors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	1	Majo	 or	0
28-55							-			J						5		
56-83						Gei	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									2		-		,	_
01 100	-	3.00 3.17	J	2 0								_			_			_

Electives

Other

0

3

0

Ρ

I

Course-Section: EDUC 612 8010
Title MESSAGE DESIGN
Instructor: WALSH, GREGORY

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 549 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 9
Questionnaires: 9
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General	_	•	•	•	_	_		4 00	1000/1504	4 00	4 40	4 00		4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	2		1092/1504		4.43	4.27	4.44	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	3		1052/1503		4.34	4.20	4.28	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	Τ	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	783/1290		4.56	4.28	4.36	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	924/1453		4.43	4.21	4.34	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	7	1	2		1056/1421	3.60	4.31	4.00	4.27	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	-	-	3	2	2		935/1365		4.38	4.08	4.35	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	1	0	0	1	<i>3</i>		1200/1485		4.33	4.16	4.24	3.71
-	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	5.00	1/1504		4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	U	U	U	U	2	5	۷	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	3		1123/1425		4.50	4.41	4.51	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	790/1426		4.80	4.69	4.80	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	877/1418		4.45	4.25	4.36	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44			4.35	4.26	4.38	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	593/1199	4.11	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	183/1312	4.78	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	217/1303	4.89	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	223/1299	4.89	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	4.28	4.01	4.24	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 233	****	4.67	4.09	4.56	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 244		4.55	4.09	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 227		4.69	4.40	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 225		4.83	4.23	4.69	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 207		4.80	4.09	4.40	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5 00	****/ 76	****	4.47	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 70		4.06	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 67		4.32	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 76		4.52	4.44	4.40	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 73		4.18	4.17	4.15	***
mini di manda														
Field Work	0	0	0	^	0	^	1	F 00	**** LO	4444	4 40	4 42	4 21	
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0			****/ 58					
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	U	U			****/ 56					
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44 ****/ 47			$4.65 \\ 4.29$		****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		•			4.29		****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.5/	4.44	4.55	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.26	4.53	4.37	****
•														

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	35	***	4.30	4.49	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	36	****	4.69	4.60	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	20	****	3.04	4.24	3.16	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	16	****	4.48	4.51	4.40	****

Course-Section: EDUC 612 8010
Title MESSAGE DESIGN
Instructor: WALSH, GREGORY

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005 Page 549 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 9
Questionnaires: 9
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	8	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_		_	
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 620 8010

DEV CBT/WBT MATERIALS

Title Instructor: AHMAD, RAFI E

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 550 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Fre	equer	ncies	3		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	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	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.44	5.00
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.50
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.50
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.31	4.00	4.27	5.00
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	297/1365	4.50	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.50
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.33	4.16	4.24	5.00
8.		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.00
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	784/1425	4.50	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.50
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.45	4.25	4.36	5.00
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.50
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	271/1199	4.50	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.50
	Discussion														
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.47	4.00	4.31	5.00
2.	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.58	5.00
3.	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.56	5.00
4.	Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	4.28	4.01	4.24	4.50
	Laboratory														
	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.67	4.09	4.56	5.00
	Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	83/ 244	4.50	4.55	4.09	4.09	4.50
3.	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 227	5.00	4.69	4.40	4.66	5.00
_	Seminar	_	_	_	_		_	_							
	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.47	4.61	4.57	5.00
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/ 70	5.00	4.06	4.35	4.21	5.00
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/ 67	5.00	4.32	4.34	4.48	5.00
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/ 76	5.00	4.51	4.44	4.39	5.00
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	4.18	4.17	4.15	5.00
	Field Work														
1	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.42	4.43	4.31	5.00
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 56	5.00	4.42	4.43	4.31	5.00
	Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	39/ 44	4.00	4.29	4.23		4.00
		1	0	0	0	0	1	-	4.00	28/ 47		4.77			
4.	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	Т	U	U	U	U	т	U	4.00	40/ 4/	4.00	4.38	4.29	4.41	4.00
	Self Paced														
1	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	30/ 40	4.00	4.26	4.53	4.37	4.00
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	27/ 35	4.00	4.30	4.49	4.46	4.00
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 36		4.69	4.60	4.75	5.00
٥.	1001 contacts with the instructor neighbor	U	_	J	3	3	5	_	5.00	1, 30	3.00	1.00	1.00	1.75	3.00

Course-Section: EDUC 620 8010

Title DEV CBT/WBT MATERIALS

Instructor: AHMAD, RAFI E

Enrollment: 5
Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 550 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: EDUC 622 0101

INSTRUC STRGY ELEM MAT

Instructor: KINACH, BARBARA

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 9

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 551 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	5	1	3	0	2.78	1479/1504	2.78	4.43	4.27	4.44	2.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	2	0	2.67	1472/1503	2.67	4.34	4.20	4.28	2.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1290	****	4.56	4.28	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	5	0	4	0	2.89	1427/1453	2.89	4.43	4.21	4.34	2.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	1	2	0	0	1.63	1421/1421	1.63	4.31	4.00	4.27	1.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	2	0	2.88	1319/1365	2.88	4.38	4.08	4.35	2.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	1434/1485	2.71	4.33	4.16	4.24	2.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	891/1504	4.75	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	3	2	3	0	0	2.00	1468/1483	2.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	2.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1425	****	4.50	4.41	4.51	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1426	****	4.80	4.69	4.80	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1418	****	4.45	4.25	4.36	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1416	****	4.35	4.26	4.38	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1199	****	4.07	3.97	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	1	3	0	2.44	1255/1312	2.44	4.47	4.00	4.31	2.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	2	3	2	3.56	1108/1303	3.56	4.67	4.24	4.58	3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	3	4	0	2	3.11	1189/1299	3.11	4.72	4.25	4.56	3.11
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	1	1	5	0	3.25	648/ 758	3.25	4.28	4.01	4.24	3.25

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

Course-Section: EDUC 636 0101

ESL/FOR LANG TEST & EV

Title NELSON, JOHN E. Instructor:

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 552 JUN 14, 2005 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														
	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	1 22	700/1504	4 22	1 12	4 07	1 11	1 22
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	∠ 1	3	4.33	788/1504	4.33	4.43	4.27	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	Ţ	Τ	4	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	344/1290	4.67	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	270/1453	4.67	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	320/1421	4.50	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	672/1365	4.17	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.33	4.16	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1061/1483	3.83	4.18	4.06	4.20	3.83
Lecture														
	0	0	0	0	0	1	_	4.83	285/1425	4.83	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.83
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	-	-	0	0	1	Τ	5		,					
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	•	1	0	5	4.67	967/1426	4.67	4.80	4.69	4.80	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	930/1418	4.17	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	Τ	2	3	4.33	806/1416	4.33	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	919/1199	3.50	4.07	3.97	4.04	3.50
Discussion														
	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	716/1312	4.00	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	-	-	0	0	∠ 1	1	4		- , -					
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	J.	1	4	4.50	563/1303	4.50	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	3	Τ	2		1025/1299	3.83	4.72	4.25	4.56	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	Τ	0	U	Τ	1	3	0	3.40	614/ 758	3.40	4.28	4.01	4.24	3.40

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

Course-Section: EDUC 640 8010

PROG CBT/WBT MATERIALS

Title Instructor: KELLERMAN, PAUL

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 11

Spring 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 553 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	198/1504	4.82	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	449/1503	4.55	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1290	***	4.56	4.28	4.36	***
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1191/1453	3.75	4.43	4.21	4.34	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	194/1421	4.70	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	547/1365	4.29	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	412/1485	4.55	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82		4.82	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	772/1483	4.13	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	474/1425	4.73	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	526/1418	4.55	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	854/1416	4.27	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	479/1199	4.27	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	4	2	3.55	997/1312	3.55	4.47	4.00	4.31	3.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	889/1303	4.09	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	714/1299	4.36	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	0	10	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 758	***	4.28	4.01	4.24	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	102/ 233	4.33	4.67	4.09	4.56	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	83/ 244	4.50	4.55	4.09	4.09	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	_		125/ 227	4.50	4.69	4.40	4.66	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	2	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 225	****	4.83	4.23	4.69	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	***	4.80	4.09	4.40	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	59/ 76	4.50	4.47	4.61	4.57	4.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	57/ 70	4.00	4.06	4.35	4.21	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	2	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	69/ 76	3.50	4.51	4.44	4.39	3.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	44/ 73	4.00	4.18	4.17	4.15	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.42	4.43	4.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 56	****	4.29	4.23	4.26	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.38	4.29	4.41	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 39	***	4.57	4.44	4.55	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.26	4.53	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.20	4.53	4.37	***
2. Did beddy quescions make creat the expected goal	10	U	U	U	_	U	U	3.00	/ 33		1.50	1.IJ	1.10	

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/	36	****	4.69	4.60	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/	20	****	3.04	4.24	3.16	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00 ****/	16	****	4.48	4.51	4.40	****

Course-Section: EDUC 640 8010

Title PROG CBT/WBT MATERIALS

Instructor: KELLERMAN, PAUL

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 553 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	 А	 7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	5	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sid	gnificant	
				I	1	Other	8	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 648 8010
Title CONSULTING

Title CONSULTING
Instructor: ERDMAN, CAROL B

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 554
JUN 14, 2005
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	<u> </u>				ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	151/1503	4.83	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	344/1290	4.67	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.43	4.21	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	212/1421	4.67	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	105/1365	4.83	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	670/1485	4.33	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1337/1504	4.17	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	149/1483	4.75	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	784/1425	4.50	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	378/1418	4.67	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.35	4.26	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1138/1199	2.50	4.07	3.97	4.04	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.47	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.28	4.01	4.24	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.47	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	***	4.06	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	***	4.32	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	***	4.51	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.18	4.17	4.15	****

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

Course-Section: EDUC 650 0101

EDUC IN CULTURAL PERSP

Title Instructor: SEILER, GALE

Enrollment: 21

Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 555 JUN 14, 2005 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
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from	this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	367/1504	4.65	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expe	ected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	15	4.65	324/1503	4.65	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the exp	pected goals	0	14	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	180/1290	4.83	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expe	ected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	17	4.70	240/1453	4.70	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to w		0	0	0	2	2	5	11	4.25	548/1421	4.25	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to		0	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	297/1365	4.50	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explain	ned	1	0	1	1	2	3	12	4.26	750/1485	4.26	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teach	ing effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	3	13	4.50	338/1483	4.50	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.50
Tankuus															
Lecture		0	0	0	1	1	2	1.0	4 (5	F07/1/0F	4 65	4 50	1 11	<i>1</i> F1	4 65
1. Were the instructor's lectures well p		0	0	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	587/1425	4.65	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in		0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	301/1426	4.95	4.80	4.69	4.80	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and exp		0	0	0	0	0			4.75	261/1418	4.75	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you		0	2	0 2	0 1	0 3	6		4.70	407/1416		4.35	4.26	4.38	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance you	ir understanding	1	2	2	Т	3	4	7	3.76	815/1199	3.76	4.07	3.97	4.04	3.76
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to w	nat you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	176/1312	4.79	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged		1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	207/1303	4.89	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and		1	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	425/1299	4.68	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.68
4. Were special techniques successful	-	1	0	1	0	1	3	14	4.53	178/ 758	4.53	4.28	4.01	4.24	4.53
Laboratory				_	_	_	_	_							
2. Were you provided with adequate backg	round information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	***	4.55	4.09	4.09	****
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the	announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.47	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for indi-		19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.06	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to w		19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what	-	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	***	4.51	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	•	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.18	4.17	4.15	****
Field Work				_	_	_	_	_							
1. Did field experience contribute to who		18	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 58	****	4.42	4.43	4.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation		18	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 56	****	4.29	4.23	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for const		18	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 44	****	4.77	4.65	4.74	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your		18	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 47	****	4.38	4.29	4.41	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out fig	eld activities	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 39	***	4.57	4.44	4.55	****
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to w	nat you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.26	4.53	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the exp		19	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 35	****	4.30	4.49	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor		19	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 36	****	4.69	4.60	4.75	****
<u> </u>	L	-	-		-	-		-		,					

Course-Section: EDUC 650 0101

Title EDUC IN CULTURAL PERSP

Instructor: SEILER, GALE

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 555 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	10	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	10	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: EDUC 655 0101

Title TCH READ WRIT ESL II

Instructor: CRANDALL, JOANN

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 556
JUN 14, 2005
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				_	ncies		_		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	639/1504	4.44	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	5	9	4.18	928/1503	4.18	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1290	****	4.56	4.28	4.36	***
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	8	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	429/1421	4.39	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	12	4.44	370/1365	4.44	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	0	1	9	4	3.65	1230/1485	3.65	4.33	4.16	4.24	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17		394/1504	4.94	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	635/1483	4.25	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.25
Lecture	_	•	•		_	_	1.0	4 = 0	504/1405	4 50	4 50	4 4 7	4 = 4	4 50
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	1	12	4.50	784/1425	4.50	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2		4.88	572/1426	4.88	4.80	4.69	4.80	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	2	4	7		1072/1418	3.94	4.45	4.25	4.36	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0 2	1 0	1	0 4	4		4.31		4.31	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	U	U	4	4	5	4.08	610/1199	4.08	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	2	11	4.29	565/1312	4.29	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	770/1303	4.29	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	848/1299	4.18	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	7	5	4	3.65	542/ 758			4.01	4.24	
-														
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	4.80	4.09	4.40	****
<u>.</u>														
Seminar		•	•	•	•	•	_			4.4.4.4	4 45	4 6 7	4 55	***
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.47	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	Ţ		****/ 70		4.06	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 67		4.32	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	U		****/ 76 ****/ 73		4.51	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	U	U	U	U	Τ	U	4.00	^^**/ /3	***	4.18	4.17	4.15	***
_		- ·	.,											

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	А	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	12	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	3	Under-grad	6	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 658 0101

READING CONTENT AREA I

Instructor: COWAN, CHARISSE

Enrollment: 3
Questionnaires: 2

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 557 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	1						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	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503		4.34	4.20	4.28	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1290		4.56	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1453		4.43	4.21	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.31	4.00	4.27	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.38	4.08	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.33	4.16	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.50	4.41	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1418	5.00	4.45	4.25	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1416		4.35	4.26	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1199		4.07	3.97	4.04	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	Λ	0	2 00	1149/1312	3.00	4.47	4.00	4.31	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1303		4.47	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1299		4.72		4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage rair and open discussion		U	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	1/1299	3.00	4.72	4.23	4.50	3.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.42	4.43	4.31	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	29/ 56	4.50	4.29	4.23	4.26	4.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.77	4.65	4.74	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.38	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	30/ 39	4.00	4.57	4.44	4.55	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.26	4.53	4.37	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.30	4.49	4.46	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	4.69	4.60	4.75	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	13/ 16	4.00	4.48	4.51	4.40	4.00

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

? 0

Course-Section: EDUC 659 0101
Title READ CONTNT AREA II
Instructor: COWAN, CHARISSE

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 558 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Instru	actor	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	1/1504	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.34	4.20	4.28	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.43	4.21	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.31	4.00	4.27	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.38	4.08	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.33	4.16	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.42	4.43	4.31	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 56	5.00	4.29	4.23	4.26	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.77	4.65	4.74	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.38	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.57	4.44	4.55	5.00

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

Course-Section: EDUC 669 0101
Title ASSESS READING
Instructor: BROOKS, WANDA

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 559 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	183/1504	4.83	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1290	4.80	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	270/1453	4.67	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	247/1421	4.60	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	114/1365	4.80	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	150/1485	4.80	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled			0	0	0	1	4	4.80	830/1504	4.80	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	635/1483	4.25	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	285/1425	4.83	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	378/1418	4.67	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	271/1199	4.50	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	148/1312	4.83	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	268/1303	4.83	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	273/1299	4.83	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.28	4.01	4.24	5.00
-														

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

Course-Section: EDUC 671 8030

PRIN OF TRNG AND DEV

Instructor: BERGE, ZAN

Questionnaires: 3

Title

Enrollment:

BERGE, ZANE 18 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 560 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	357/1504	4.67	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	751/1503	4.33	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.43	4.21	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.31	4.00	4.27	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.38	4.08	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	290/1485	4.67	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	211/1483	4.67	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.67
Lecture	1	0	0	_	0	_	_	г оо	1 /1 405	F 00	4 50	4 41	4 - 1	г оо
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	·	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.50	4.41	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1 1	0	0	0	0	1 1	1	4.50	1128/1426 578/1418	4.50 4.50	4.80 4.45	4.69 4.25	4.80 4.36	4.50 4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.45	4.25	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.33	3.97		5.00
3. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		_	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	1/1199	3.00	1.07	3.91	1.01	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	716/1312	4.00	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.67
Seminar	•	•	•	•	•	•	-	- 00	1 / 50	- 00	4 0 6	4 05	4 01	- 00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 70	5.00	4.06	4.35	4.21	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	4.32	4.34	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2 2	0	0	0	0	1 1	0	4.00	58/ 76 44/ 73	4.00	4.51 4.18	$4.44 \\ 4.17$	4.39 4.15	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	U	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	44/ /3	4.00	4.18	4.1/	4.15	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.26	4.53	4.37	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.30	4.49	4.46	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	29/ 36	4.00	4.69	4.60	4.75	4.00

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

Course-Section: EDUC 678 0101

INST STRAT/DIV NEEDS

Instructor: BERGE, NANCY B

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 11

Title

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2005

Page 561 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				_	ncies	3			ructor	Course	_	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	131/1504	4.91	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	106/1503	4.91	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.56	4.28	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.43	4.21	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	123/1421	4.82	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	111/1365	4.82	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	412/1485	4.55	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	457/1483	4.40	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	525/1425	4.70	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	342/1418	4.70	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	296/1416	4.78	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	242/1199	4.56	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	121/1312	4.89	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	94/ 758	4.78	4.28	4.01	4.24	4.78
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	Λ	1	1	3.33	50/ 58	3.33	4.42	4.43	4.31	3.33
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 56	****	4.29	4.23	4.26	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 47	****	4.38	4.29	4.41	****
1. II mini highes source for around four statements	_	ŭ	ŭ	ŭ	·	٠	-	2.00	, 1,		1.55			

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	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	6	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				2	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 680 8720

Title SEMINAR IN TEACHER RSC

Instructor: JEFFERSON, CHER

Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 562 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	:		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	3	10	4.64	376/1504	4.64	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	891/1503	4.21	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1290	****	4.56	4.28	4.36	***
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	194/1453	4.75	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	459/1421	4.36	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	169/1365	4.70	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	180/1485	4.78	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	338/1483	4.50	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	492/1425	4.71	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	401/1426	4.93	4.80	4.69	4.80	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	488/1418	4.57	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	472/1416	4.64	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	636/1199	4.00	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	176/1312	4.79	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	157/1303	4.93	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	121/ 758	4.70	4.28	4.01	4.24	4.70
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	40/ 76	4.80	4.47	4.61	4.57	4.80
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	34/ 70	4.70	4.06	4.35	4.21	4.70
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	32/ 67	4.70	4.32	4.34	4.48	4.70
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	28/ 76	4.80	4.51	4.44	4.39	4.80
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	25/ 73	4.70	4.18	4.17	4.15	4.70

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	 12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	9	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	5	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	9	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_		_	
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 688 0101

Title METHODOLOGY TEACH ESL

Instructor: NELSON, JOHN E.

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 563 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	131/1504	4.91	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	164/1503	4.82	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	280/1290	4.73	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	215/1453	4.73	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	449/1421	4.36	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	154/1365	4.73	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	98/1485	4.91	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	282/1483	4.57	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.50	4.41	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	184/1418	4.82	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	142/1416	4.91	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	574/1199	4.14	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	٥	4.64	276/1312	4.64	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	Τ.	10	4.82	288/1303	4.82	4.47	4.24	4.51	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	111/ 758		4.72	4.25	4.24	
4. Were special techniques successiui	U	U	U	U			פ	4.73	111/ /36	4.73	4.20	4.01	4.24	4.73
Laboratory														
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.69	4.40	4.66	****

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

Course-Section: EDUC 689L 0101
Title SPECIAL TOPICS
Instructor: SHIN, SARAH

21

Enrollment:

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2005

Page 564 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 20 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	_	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	1	1	3	15	4.60	416/1504	4.60	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	15	4.60	380/1503	4.60	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	563/1453	4.42	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	13	4.40	410/1421	4.40	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	2	14	4.25	581/1365	4.25	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	260/1485	4.70	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	782/1483	4.12	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.12
*														
Lecture	0	0	0	0	0	2	1 -	4 65	E07/140E	4 65	4 50	4 41	4 -1	4 65
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	587/1425	4.65	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	825/1426	4.75	4.80	4.69	4.80	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	3	14	4.55	514/1418	4.55	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	1	15	4.45	701/1416	4.45	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	2	2	6	9	4.16	568/1199	4.16	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.16
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	5	5	7	3.79	887/1312	3.79	4.47	4.00	4.31	3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	1	4	3	9	3.84	1016/1303	3.84	4.67	4.24	4.58	3.84
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	2	0	3	14	4.35	723/1299	4.35	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.35
4. Were special techniques successful	0	9	3	2	2	4	0	2.64	729/ 758	2.64	4.28	4.01	4.24	2.64
- 1														
Laboratory	1.0	0	-1	•	0	0	0	1 00	++++ / 000	ale ale ale d	4 65	4 00	4 56	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	U	Τ	U	U	U	U	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.67	4.09	4.56	***

Credits E	Tarned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	 15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	11	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: EDUC 771 0101

RESEARCH DESIGNS IN ED

Instructor: OLIVA, LINDA M.

Enrollment: 4
Questionnaires: 4

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 565 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1504	4.75	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.56	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	212/1421	4.67	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	187/1365	4.67	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	670/1485	4.33	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	543/1483	4.33	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	420/1425	4.75	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	578/1418	4.50	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	871/1416	4.25	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	636/1199	4.00	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	255/1312	4.67	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	630/ 758	3.33	4.28	4.01	4.24	3.33

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
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.	3	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Ĺ
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other					
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 781 8020
Title TEACHER LEADERSHIP
Instructor: SCHAFFER, EUGEN

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2005

Page 566 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 2
Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Instr	uctor	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	1/1504	4.75	4.43	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	4.80	4.34	4.20	4.28	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1453	4.80	4.43	4.21	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.80	4.31	4.00	4.27	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1365	4.85	4.38	4.08	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1485	4.65	4.33	4.16	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	4.92	4.18	4.06	4.20	5.00
T a selection														
Lecture	0	0	_	•	_	^	-1	F 00	1 /1 405	4 00	4 50	4 41	4 - 1	F 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	4.90	4.50	4.41	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426		4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1418		4.45	4.25	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1416	4.85	4.35	4.26	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1199	4.00	4.07	3.97	4.04	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	Λ	1	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.47	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1303	4.94	4.67	4.24	4.58	5.00
	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1299		4.72	4.25	4.56	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0		0	0	0	0	1		,					
4. Were special techniques successful	U	0	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	1/ 758	4.33	4.28	4.01	4.24	5.00

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

Course-Section: EDUC 781 8720

Title TEACHER LEADERSHIP

Instructor: SCHAFFER, EUGEN

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 567 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				equer			_		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	0	5	5	4.50	549/1504	4.75	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	380/1503	4.80	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	711/1290	4.33	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	331/1453	4.80	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	247/1421	4.80	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	169/1365	4.85	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	705/1485	4.65	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	657/1504	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	108/1483	4.92	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.83
Lecture		_	_		_	_	_							
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	331/1425	4.90		4.41	4.51	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	126/1418	4.95	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	407/1416	4.85	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1050/1199	4.00	4.07	3.97	4.04	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.47	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	217/1303	4.94	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	223/1299	4.94	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	535/ 758	4.33	4.28	4.01	4.24	3.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.47	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.06	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.51	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.18	4.17	4.15	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	4.48	4.51	4.40	****
1 survey process for all one seatones	-	ŭ	ŭ	_	ŭ	Ü	ŭ		, 10		11.10	1.01	1.10	

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	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	6	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 791P 0101
Title PRACT SCHOOL ISD
Instructor: MURPHY, JOYCE A

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005 Page 568 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 5
Questionnaires: 5
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1503		4.34	4.20	4.28	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1		****/1290		4.56	4.28	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1453		4.43	4.21	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	127/1421	4.80	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.38	4.08	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	150/1485	4.80	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1425	****	4.50	4.41	4.51	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1426	****	4.80	4.69	4.80	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1418	***	4.45	4.25	4.36	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1199	****	4.07	3.97	4.04	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.47	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303		4.67	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299		4.72	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 758		4.28	4.01	4.24	
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	55/ 76	4.60	4.47	4.61	4.57	4.60
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	1 0	1	4	4.80	55/ 76 26/ 70		4.47	4.81	4.21	4.80
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	34/ 67		4.32	4.34	4.48	4.60
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	28/ 76		4.51	4.44	4.39	4.80
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 73		4.18	4.17	4.15	5.00
Field Work	0	0	_	•	0	_	_	F 00	1 / 50	F 00	4 40	4 42	4 21	F 00
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 58		4.42	4.43	4.31	5.00
 Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria Was the instructor available for consultation 	0	0	0	0	0	3 1	2 4	4.40	32/ 56		4.29	4.23	4.26	4.40
	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.80	21/ 44 22/ 47		4.77 4.38	4.65 4.29	4.74	4.80
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	22/ 47 21/ 39		4.57	4.29	4.41 4.55	4.60 4.60
3. Did conferences help you carry out freta activities	U	U	U	U	U	4	3	4.00	Z1/ 33	1.00	1.5/	4.44	±. JJ	4.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	ution	ı									

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

I 0 Other 4 ? 0

Course-Section: EDUC 791S 0101

Title

Instructor: SHIN, SARAH

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 569 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1353/1504	3.50	4.43	4.27	4.44	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	320/1421	4.50	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1065/1365	3.67	4.38	4.08	4.35	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	761/1485	4.25	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	331/1425	4.80	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	738/1426	4.80	4.80	4.69	4.80	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1029/1416	4.00	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	369/1199	4.40	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	148/1312	4.83	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	563/1303	4.50	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	***	4.28	4.01	4.24	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	70/ 76	3.50	4.47	4.61	4.57	3.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	- ,	****	4.06	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	69/ 76	3.50	4.51	4.44	4.39	3.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	***	4.18	4.17	4.15	***

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	_		-	
				2	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 792C 8020
Title CAPSTONE SEMINAR
Instructor: BOYER, SUSAN N

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2005

Page 570 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 1
Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3	Instr	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA					Mean	Rank			Mean	Mean	Mean

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

Course-Section: EDUC 792C 8720 Title CAPSTONE SEMINAR BOYER, SUSAN N

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 571 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 15

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	168/1504	4.86	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	85/1503	4.93	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.56	4.28	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	129/1453	4.86	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	127/1421	4.80	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	100/1365	4.86	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	170/1485	4.79	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	409/1483	4.44	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	176/1312	4.79	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	157/1303	4.93	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	395/1299	4.71	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	121/ 758	4.69	4.28	4.01	4.24	4.69
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	38/ 76	4.86	4.47	4.61	4.57	4.86
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	19/ 70	4.93	4.06	4.35	4.21	4.93
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	21/ 67	4.93	4.32	4.34	4.48	4.93
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	26/ 76	4.86	4.51	4.44	4.39	4.86
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	19/ 73	4.86	4.18	4.17	4.15	4.86

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5 5	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Ĺ
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 792L 0101

Title

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 4

Instructor: CRANDALL, JOANN

4

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 572 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

			F	reque	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1504	4.75	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	495/1503		4.34	4.20	4.28	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	937/1290		4.56	4.28	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	270/1453	4.67	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1305/1421	3.00	4.31	4.00	4.27	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1003/1365	3.75	4.38	4.08	4.35	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	200/1485	4.75	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	572/1425	4.67	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	378/1418	4.67	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	446/1416	4.67	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	636/1199	4.00	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.47	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	4.28	4.01	4.24	4.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.42	4.43	4.31	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	29/ 56	4.50	4.29	4.23	4.26	4.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.77	4.65	4.74	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.38	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.57	4.44	4.55	5.00
Frequ	iency	Di:	stri	butio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3		Re	equi:	 red f	or M	ajor	 S	0	 Graduat	 e	2	Majo	 or	0

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 573
JUN 14, 2005
Job IRBR3029

Instructor: ZONKER, SHIRLEY (Instr. A)
Enrollment: 27

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 8

				Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-	1														
1	General Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	549/1504	4.50	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.50
	. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	219/1503	4.75	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.75
	. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	615/1290	4.43	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.43
	. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	129/1453	4.86	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.86
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	268/1421	4.57	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.57
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	245/1365	4.57	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.57
	. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	2	_	4.25	761/1485		4.33	4.16		4.25
	. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	2	-		1221/1504		4.83	4.69		4.33
	. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	457/1483		4.18	4.06		4.40
	Lecture														
	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	285/1425	4.33	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.33
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	620/1426	4.46	4.80	4.69	4.80	4.46
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	317/1418	4.43	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.43
	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	380/1416		4.35	4.26	4.38	4.55
5	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	91/1199	4.59	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.59
	Pinnerin														
1	Discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	1 06	127/1210	1 06	1 17	4 00	1 21	1 06
	. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0 0	0	1 2	6 5	4.86 4.71	137/1312 401/1303	4.86 4.71	4.47 4.67	4.00	4.31	
	. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	5 6	4.71	253/1299		4.67	4.24 4.25	4.58	4.71
	. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion . Were special techniques successful	1 1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	73/ 758		4.72	4.25	4.56 4.24	4.86
4	. Were special techniques successiul		U	U	U	U		O	4.00	73/ 736	4.00	4.20	4.01	4.24	4.00
	Laboratory														
1	. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	47/ 233	4.67	4.67	4.09	4.56	4.67
2	. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	69/ 244	4.57	4.55	4.09	4.09	4.57
3	. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	82/ 227	4.67	4.69	4.40	4.66	4.67
4	. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	46/ 225	4.83	4.83	4.23	4.69	4.83
5	. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	29/ 207	4.80	4.80	4.09	4.40	4.80
1	Seminar	1	-1	0	0	1	0	_	4 67	FO / 76	4 67	4 47	1 (1	4 57	4 67
	. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	50/ 76	4.67	4.47	4.61	4.57	4.67
	. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	41/ 70	4.57	4.06	4.35	4.21	4.57
	. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	4.32	4.34	4.48	5.00
	. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1 1	0	0	0	0	0 1	7 6	5.00	1/ 76 19/ 73	5.00	4.51	4.44	4.39	5.00
5	. Were criteria for grading made clear	Т	U	U	U	U	Т	б	4.86	19/ 73	4.86	4.18	4.17	4.15	4.86
	Field Work														
1	. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	29/ 58	4.83	4.42	4.43	4.31	4.83
2	. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	24/ 56	4.67	4.29	4.23	4.26	4.67
	. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	28/ 44		4.77		4.74	
	. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	15/ 47			4.29		
5	. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	17/ 39	4.67	4.57	4.44	4.55	4.67
-	Self Paced	-	0	0	0	-	0	_	4 53	25/ 42	4 51	4 06	4 50	4 25	4 53
Т	. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	25/ 40	4./1	4.26	4.53	4.3/	4./1

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	20/	35	4.83	4.30	4.49	4.46	4.83
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	24/	36	4.71	4.69	4.60	4.75	4.71
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	13/	20	4.57	3.04	4.24	3.16	4.57
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	9/	16	4.60	4.48	4.51	4.40	4.60

Course-Section: EDUC 792U 0101
Title ISD INTERNSHIP
Instructor: ZONKER, SHIRLEY (Instr. A)

27

Enrollment:

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2005

Page 573 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 8 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

(Instr. B)

Baltimore County Spring 2005

University of Maryland Page 574 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 8

				Fre	quer	cies			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	s from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	549/1504	4.50	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear th	1 3	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	219/1503	4.75	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect t		1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	615/1290	4.43	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect th		1	0	0	0	0	1		4.86	129/1453	4.86	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute	-	1	0	0	0	1	1		4.57		4.57	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribu		1	0	0	0	0	3		4.57	245/1365	4.57	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly e	-	0	0	1	0	0	2		4.25	761/1485	4.25	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.25
8. How many times was class cancell		2	0	0	0	1	2	3		1221/1504	4.33	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall	teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1483	4.40	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.40
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures v	well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	784/1425	4.33	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interest		6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1128/1426	4.46	4.80	4.69	4.80	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented a	_	6	0	0	0	0	1		4.50	578/1418	4.43	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to		6	0	0	0	0	1		4.50	623/1416		4.35	4.26	4.38	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhar	=	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	271/1199	4.59	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.59
-	-														
Discussion	on														
1. Did class discussions contribute	e to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	137/1312	4.86	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.86
2. Were all students actively encou	uraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	401/1303	4.71	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage far	_	1	0	0	0	0	1		4.86	253/1299	4.86	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.86
4. Were special techniques successi	ful	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	73/ 758	4.86	4.28	4.01	4.24	4.86
Laborato	rv														
1. Did the lab increase understand:	4	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	47/ 233	4.67	4.67	4.09	4.56	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate		1	0	0	0	0	3		4.57	69/ 244	4.57	4.55	4.09	4.09	4.57
3. Were necessary materials available		1	1	0	0	0	2		4.67	82/ 227	4.67	4.69	4.40	4.66	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide a		2	0	0	0	0	1		4.83	46/ 225		4.83	4.23		4.83
5. Were requirements for lab report		2	1	0	0	0	1		4.80	29/ 207	4.80	4.80	4.09		4.80
Seminar		1	-1	0	0	1	^	_	4 67	FO / 76	4 67	4 47	4 61	4 57	4 67
1. Were assigned topics relevant to		1	1 0	0	0 1	1 0	0	5	4.67	50/ 76 41/ 70	4.67	4.47		4.57	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for		1	1	0	0	0			4.57	,		4.06	4.35	4.21	4.57
3. Did research projects contribute		1	0	-	0	-	0	6 7	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	4.32		4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to	_	1 1	0	0	0	0	0 1	6	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.51	4.44	4.39	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made of	clear	Τ	U	U	U	U	Τ	ь	4.86	19/ 73	4.86	4.18	4.17	4.15	4.86
Field Wor	rk														
1. Did field experience contribute	to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	29/ 58	4.83	4.42	4.43	4.31	4.83
2. Did you clearly understand your		2	0	0	0	0	2	4		24/ 56	4.67	4.29	4.23	4.26	4.67
3. Was the instructor available for		2	0	0	0	1	0		4.67	28/ 44		4.77	4.65	4.74	4.67
4. To what degree could you discuss		2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	15/ 47	4.83	4.38	4.29	4.41	4.83
5. Did conferences help you carry of	out field activities	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	17/ 39	4.67	4.57	4.44	4.55	4.67
Self Pag	ced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute		1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	25/ 40	4.71	4.26	4.53	4.37	4.71

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	20/	35	4.83	4.30	4.49	4.46	4.83
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	24/	36	4.71	4.69	4.60	4.75	4.71
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	13/	20	4.57	3.04	4.24	3.16	4.57
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	9/	16	4.60	4.48	4.51	4.40	4.60

Course-Section: EDUC 792U 0101 University of Maryland Page 574
Title ISD INTERNSHIP Baltimore County JUN 14, 2005

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Spring 2005

Job IRBR3029

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

Baltimore County Spring 2005

Course-Section: EDUC 792U 0101 University of Maryland Page 575 ISD INTERNSHIP JUN 14, 2005 (Instr. C) Job IRBR3029 Instructor:

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 8

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	549/1504	4.50	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	219/1503	4.75	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43		4.43	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	129/1453	4.86	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	268/1421	4.57	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	245/1365	4.57	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	761/1485	4.25	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1221/1504	4.33	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1483	4.40	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1308/1425	4.33	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	0	1		1319/1426	4.46	4.80	4.69	4.80	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	0	1		1013/1418	4.43	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	623/1416	4.55	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	271/1199	4.59	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	137/1312	4.86	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	401/1303	4.71	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	253/1299	4.86		4.25	4.56	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	73/ 758	4.86	4.28	4.01		4.86
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	47/ 233	4.67	4.67	4.09	4.56	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	3		4.57	69/ 244	4.57	4.55	4.09	4.09	4.57
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	0	0	0	2		4.67	82/ 227	4.67	4.69	4.40	4.66	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1		4.83	46/ 225	4.83	4.83	4.23	4.69	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	0	1	4		29/ 207	4.80	4.80	4.09	4.40	4.80
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	50/ 76	4.67	4.47	4.61	4.57	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	41/ 70	4.57	4.06	4.35	4.21	4.57
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 67	5.00		4.34	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.51	4.44	4.39	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	19/ 73	4.86	4.18	4.17	4.15	4.86
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	29/ 58	4.83	4.42	4.43	4.31	4.83
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	24/ 56	4.67		4.23	4.26	4.67
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	28/ 44	4.67	4.77	4.65	4.74	4.67
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	15/ 47	4.83	4.38	4.29	4.41	4.83
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	17/ 39	4.67	4.57	4.44	4.55	4.67
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	25/ 40	4.71	4.26	4.53	4.37	4.71

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	20/	35	4.83	4.30	4.49	4.46	4.83
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	24/	36	4.71	4.69	4.60	4.75	4.71
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	13/	20	4.57	3.04	4.24	3.16	4.57
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	9/	16	4.60	4.48	4.51	4.40	4.60

Course-Section: EDUC 792U 0101 University of Maryland Page 575
Title ISD INTERNSHIP Baltimore County JUN 14, 2005

Instructor: (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 8

Spring 2005
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

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

(Instr. D)

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2005

Page 576 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 8

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_		Mean	Mean
~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	549/1504	4.50	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	219/1503	4.75	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	615/1290	4.43	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	129/1453	4.86	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	268/1421	4.57	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	245/1365	4.57	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	761/1485	4.25	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1221/1504	4.33	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1483	4.40	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	784/1425	4.33	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1128/1426	4.46	4.80	4.69	4.80	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	578/1418	4.43	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	623/1416	4.55	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	271/1199	4.59	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	137/1312	4.86	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	401/1303	4.71	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	253/1299	4.86	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	73/ 758	4.86	4.28	4.01	4.24	4.86
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	47/ 233	4.67	4.67	4.09	4.56	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	69/ 244	4.57	4.55	4.09	4.09	4.57
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	82/ 227	4.67	4.69	4.40	4.66	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	46/ 225	4.83	4.83	4.23	4.69	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	29/ 207	4.80	4.80	4.09	4.40	4.80
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	50/ 76	4.67	4.47	4.61	4.57	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	41/ 70	4.57	4.06	4.35	4.21	4.57
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	4.32	4.34	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.51	4.44	4.39	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	19/ 73	4.86	4.18	4.17	4.15	4.86
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1		4.83	29/ 58	4.83	4.42	4.43	4.31	4.83
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	24/ 56	4.67	4.29	4.23	4.26	4.67
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	1	0		4.67	28/ 44	4.67	4.77	4.65	4.74	4.67
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	15/ 47	4.83	4.38	4.29	4.41	4.83
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	17/ 39	4.67	4.57	4.44	4.55	4.67
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	25/ 40	4.71	4.26	4.53	4.37	4.71

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	20/	35	4.83	4.30	4.49	4.46	4.83
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	24/	36	4.71	4.69	4.60	4.75	4.71
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	13/	20	4.57	3.04	4.24	3.16	4.57
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	9/	16	4.60	4.48	4.51	4.40	4.60

Course-Section: EDUC 792U 0101 University of Maryland Page 576
Title ISD INTERNSHIP Baltimore County JUN 14, 2005

Instructor: (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Spring 2005

Job IRBR3029

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

Course-Section: EDUC 794 0101

ISD PROJECT SEMINAR

Title Instructor: KINERNEY, DONNA

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 6 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 577 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			Fre	requencies 2 3		3	5	Instructor Mean Rank		Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	•	•		•	_	_		4 50	E 40 /1 E 0 4	4 50	4 40	4 00		4 50
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	Τ	Τ.	4	4.50	549/1504		4.43	4.27	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	Τ	4.17	937/1503		4.34	4.20	4.28	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	711/1290		4.56	4.28	4.36	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	440/1453		4.43	4.21	4.34	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	U	0	0	1	2	4.67	212/1421		4.31	4.00	4.27	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	297/1365		4.38	4.08	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	Ţ		1128/1485		4.33	4.16	4.24	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1504		4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	Τ	0	0	2	Т	3.50	1233/1483	3.50	4.18	4.06	4.20	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.50	4.41	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426		4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	191/1418		4.45	4.25	4.36	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	754/1416		4.35	4.26	4.38	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	636/1199		4.07	3.97	4.04	
	_	-	-	_	_	-	_		,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	297/1312	4.60	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	299/1303	4.80	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	303/1299	4.80	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	154/ 758	4.60	4.28	4.01	4.24	4.60
Seminar	_	_	_	_	_	_								
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 76		4.47	4.61	4.57	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 70		4.06	4.35	4.21	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	34/ 67		4.32	4.34	4.48	4.60
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	44/ 76		4.51	4.44	4.39	4.60
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	28/ 73	4.60	4.18	4.17	4.15	4.60

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

Course-Section: EDUC 795 0101 University of Maryland
Title SEM STUDY TEACHING Baltimore County
Instructor: SCHAFFER, EUGEN Spring 2005

Enrollment:

3

Page 578 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

uestionnaires:	3	Student Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
descronnaries.	3	Scudenc Course	Evaluation	Quescionnaire

		Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	788/1504	4.33	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	312/1503	4.67	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.56	4.28	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	745/1421	4.00	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	493/1365	4.33	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	670/1485	4.33	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled			0	0	0	1	2	4.67	983/1504	4.67	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.47	4.61	4.57	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	36/ 70	4.67	4.06	4.35	4.21	4.67	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	4.32	4.34	4.48	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	39/ 76	4.67	4.51	4.44	4.39	4.67	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	44/ 73	4.00	4.18	4.17	4.15	4.00	

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