University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0101

20

COMPOSITION

PEKARSKE, NICOL

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 15

Page 652 JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean		
		General	_															
		ew insights,skil			0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	461/1481	3.87	4.16	4.29	4.14	4.60
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	574/1481	4.05	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.47
	_	uestions reflect		_	0	10	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	788/1249	4.08	4.31	4.27	4.14	4.20
		uations reflect			0	1	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	863/1424	4.16	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.14
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	435/1396		4.05	3.98	3.89	4.33
				o what you learned	l 0	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	405/1342		4.34	4.07	3.88	4.40
		g system clearly		ined	0	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	827/1459	3.92	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.20
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	756/1480		4.44	4.68	4.64	
9. How w	ould you	grade the overal	ll teac	ning effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	630/1450	4.08	4.15	4.09	3.97	4.25
1		Lecture		1	1.0	•	•	0	•	•	0	F 00		4 00	4 00	4 40	4 26	****
		uctor's lectures		-	13	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1409		4.29	4.42	4.36	****
		n the subject	12	0	0	1	0	0	2		****/1407	4.58	4.68	4.69	4.57	****		
			xplained clearly	13 13	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1399		4.28	4.26	4.23	****	
	the lectures contribute to what you learned audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					-	0	0	0	1	1		****/1400		4.23	4.27	4.19	****
5. Did a	udiovisua	.1 techniques en	nance y	our understanding	12	2	U	U	U	1	0	4.00	****/1179	3.68	3.87	3.96	3.85	****
		Discuss	ni on															
1 Did a	laga diga			what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	7	5	4.00	708/1262	3.83	4.28	4.05	3.77	4.00
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	148/1259	4.21	4.53	4.03	4.06	4.93
		_	_	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	296/1256		4.56	4.30	4.08	4.80
		echniques succes		a open discussion	0	1	0	0	1	9	4	4.80	308/ 788		3.97	4.00		4.80
4. Wele	special t	ecinitques succes	SSIUI		U	_	U	U		9	4	4.21	300/ /00	3.00	3.31	4.00	3.00	4.21
				Freq	quency	y Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	3			Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	 11	0.00-0.99	A 4		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	. jor	s 1	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	1	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	в 7			_			-						3			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C 4		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		El	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Ot	her					5						
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0201 University of Maryland Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County Instructor: BURNS, MARGIE Spring 2006

Instructor: BURNS,
Enrollment: 24
Ouestionnaires: 22

84-150

Grad.

1

Ω

3.00-3.49 2

3.50-4.00

3

D 0

F 0

I 0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 653

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 4 4 7 4 3 2.91 1470/1481 3.87 4.16 4.29 4.14 2.91 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 3 3 11 3 2 2.91 1443/1481 4.05 4.23 4.23 4.18 2.91 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 3 7 5 4 3 2.86 1209/1249 4.08 4.31 4.27 4.14 2.86 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 2 4 7 6 2 3.10 1353/1424 4.16 4.33 4.21 4.06 3.10 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 3 1 8 6 4 3.32 1176/1396 3.65 4.05 3.98 3.89 3.32 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 4 3 7 3 5  $3.09\ 1257/1342\ 4.18\ 4.34\ 4.07\ 3.88\ 3.09$ 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 3 4 5 6 3 3.10 1370/1459 3.92 4.05 4.16 4.17 3.10 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 2 19 0 3.90 1420/1480 4.30 4.44 4.68 4.64 3.90 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 1 2 7 4 2 3.25 1307/1450 4.08 4.15 4.09 3.97 3.25 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 2 3 8 1 5 3.21 1342/1409 4.07 4.29 4.42 4.36 3.21 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 1 0 1 4 13 4.47 1130/1407 4.58 4.68 4.69 4.57 4.47 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 2 1 9 3 4 3.32 1282/1399 4.09 4.28 4.26 4.23 3.32 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 1 2 3 5 4 4 3.28 1279/1400 3.96 4.23 4.27 4.19 3.28 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 1 2 4 4 6 2 3.11 1035/1179 3.68 3.87 3.96 3.85 3.11 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 4 6 4 1 2.76 1194/1262 3.83 4.28 4.05 3.77 2.76 3 3 5 3.12 1157/1259 4.21 4.53 4.29 4.06 3.12 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 5 1 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 3 2 3 4 4 3.25 1145/1256 4.35 4.56 4.30 4.08 3.25 4. Were special techniques successful 6 5 1 3 5 0 3.00 713/ 788 3.66 3.97 4.00 3.80 3.00 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 19 2 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 246 \*\*\*\* 2.50 4.20 3.93 \*\*\*\* 0 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 20 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 249 \*\*\*\* 3.00 4.11 3.95 \*\*\*\* 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 19 2 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 242 \*\*\*\* 3.00 4.40 4.33 \*\*\*\* 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 19 2 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\* 240 \*\*\*\* 3.50 4.20 4.20 \*\*\*\* 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 20 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 217 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.04 4.02 \*\*\*\* Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 0 0 1.00 \*\*\*\*/ 59 \*\*\*\* 2.00 4.30 4.00 \*\*\*\* 21 0 1 0 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21 0 0 0 0 1.00 \*\*\*\*/ 51 \*\*\*\* 2.00 4.00 3.44 \*\*\*\* Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 \*\*\*\*/ 55 \*\*\*\* 3.32 4.55 4.48 \*\*\*\* 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 21 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 \*\*\*\*/ 51 \*\*\*\* 4.31 4.65 4.63 \*\*\*\* Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons 00-27 12 0.00-0.99 0 A Required for Majors 11 Graduate Major 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 в 8 C 5 56-83 2.00-2.99 6 General Under-grad 22 Non-major 22

Electives

Other

Ω

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

University of Maryland Page 654
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

0

Under-grad 20

### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Non-major 20

	Ouestionnain	

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0301

29

COMPOSITION

TERHORST, RAYMO

Title

56-83

Grad.

84-150

3

4

0

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

4

3

С

D

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

0

2

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 20

			Fre	equei	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	2	2	6	10	4.20	918/1481	3.87	4.16	4.29	4.14	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	458/1481	4.05	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	4		4.40	624/1249	4.08	4.31	4.27	4.14	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	416/1424	4.16	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	2	6	5	3.30	1181/1396	3.65	4.05	3.98	3.89	3.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	290/1342	4.18	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	611/1459	3.92	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	6	4.30	1178/1480	4.30	4.44	4.68	4.64	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	189/1450	4.08	4.15	4.09	3.97	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	Ο	5	15	4.75	417/1409	4.07	4.29	4.42	4.36	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	300/1407	4.58	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	567/1399	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	9	9	4.20	913/1400	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.19	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	5	3	7	3.94	661/1179	3.68	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	Λ	3	8	4.50	345/1262	3.83	4.28	4.05	3.77	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	Ω	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	358/1259	4.21	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	357/1256	4.35	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	176/ 788		3.97	4.00	3.80	4.50
Even	020.01	. Dia	⊦ wib		_									
Frequ	ency	DIS	CLID	utioi	11									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Туј	рe			Majors	
00-27 3 0.00-0.99 1 A 7		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 1	2	Graduat	 е	0	Majo		0
28-55 5 1.00-1.99 1 B 9														

General

Other

Electives

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0401

26

COMPOSITION

DUNNIGAN, BRIAN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Page 655 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did	you gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	15	4.48	587/1481	3.87	4.16	4.29	4.14	4.48
	-	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	9	12	4.43	617/1481	4.05	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.43
3. Did	the exam q	uestions reflec	t the	expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	357/1249	4.08	4.31	4.27	4.14	4.64
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	1	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	310/1424	4.16	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.64
5. Did	assigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	93/1396	3.65	4.05	3.98	3.89	4.87
6. Did	written as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	17	4.57	264/1342	4.18	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.57
7. Was	the gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	436/1459	3.92	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.52
8. How	many times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1480	4.30	4.44	4.68	4.64	5.00
9. How	would you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	203/1450	4.08	4.15	4.09	3.97	4.68
		Lectur																
1 Word	the instr	uctor's lecture		propared	Λ	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	574/1409	4.07	4.29	4.42	4.36	4.65
		n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.05	250/1407	4.58	4.29	4.42	4.57	4.05		
			explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	_	15	4.57	502/1399		4.28	4.26	4.23	4.57	
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	2		17	4.65	433/1400	3.96	4.23	4.27		4.65
				your understanding	0	14	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	124/1179	3.68	3.87	3.96		4.78
J. Dia	audiovisua	i teciniiques en	nance ;	our understanding	U	14	U	U	U	2	,	4.70	124/11/9	3.00	3.07	3.90	3.03	4.70
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	1	13	4.67	264/1262	3.83	4.28	4.05	3.77	4.67
				ed to participate	8	0	1	0	1	0	13	4.60	509/1259	4.21	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.60
3. Did	the instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	0	14	4.73	382/1256	4.35	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.73
4. Were	e special t	echniques succe	ssful		8	3	0	1	4	4	3	3.75	533/ 788	3.66	3.97	4.00	3.80	3.75
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ation	1									
				_	_													
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	1
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s 1	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	в 10			_			-								
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 1		Gei	nera:	1				1	Under-g	rad 2	3	Non-	major	23
84-150	) 1	3.00-3.49	8	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
				Р 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	

Other

0

0

I ? Course-Section: ENGL 100 0701 University of Maryland COMPOSITION Baltimore County BURNS, MARGIE

?

0

Spring 2006

Page 656

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 23 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Questionnaires: 19

Title

Instructor:

								-										
							Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 L															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	2	12	5	4.16	957/1481	3.87	4.16	4.29	4.14	4.16
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	0	5	6	7	3.95	1070/1481	4.05	4.23	4.23	4.18	3.95
3. Did th	e exam qu	uestions reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	1	5	6	7	4.00	893/1249	4.08	4.31	4.27	4.14	4.00
4. Did ot	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	1	1	2	6	9	4.11	908/1424	4.16	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.11
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	4	2	5	8	3.89	808/1396	3.65	4.05	3.98	3.89	3.89
				o what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	444/1342	4.18	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.37
		g system clearly			0	0	2	4	6	4	3	3.11	1369/1459	3.92	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.11
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1480	4.30	4.44	4.68	4.64	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	1	0	0	6	10	1	3.71	1142/1450	4.08	4.15	4.09	3.97	3.71
		Lecture	2															
1 Were t	he instr	actor's lectures		prepared	0	0	1	0	4	5	9	4 11	1122/1409	4.07	4.29	4.42	4.36	4.11
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	3	16		636/1407		4.68	4.69	4.57	4.84
		xplained clearly	0	0	1	0	4	7	7		1002/1399		4.28	4.26	4.23	4.00		
		es contribute to		0	0	1	0	2	7	9	4.21			4.23	4.27	4.19	4.21	
		our understanding	0	0	0	1	5	5	8	4.05	573/1179		3.87		3.85			
J. Dia au	aiovibaa.	our unacrocanaring	Ü	O	Ü	_	3	3	O	1.05	3/3/11/3	3.00	3.07	3.50	3.03	1.03		
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	4	0	0	1	5	6	3	3.73	897/1262		4.28	4.05	3.77	3.73
				d to participate	4	0	0	0	5	5	5	4.00	895/1259		4.53	4.29	4.06	4.00
		_		d open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	843/1256	4.35	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.13
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		5	1	1	3	2	6	1	3.23	693/ 788	3.66	3.97	4.00	3.80	3.23
		Self I	Paced															
1. Did se	lf-paced	system contribu	ite to	what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.32	4.55	4.48	****
2. Did st	udy quest	tions make clear	the e	xpected goal	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	3.56	4.75	4.42	****
3. Were y	our conta	acts with the in	nstruct	or helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	4.31	4.65	4.63	***
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E		Com CDA	True at ad Consider				D.a.		_			m-				M	_	
	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades					ason	.s 			ту	pe 			Majors 	; 
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	A 7		Red	quire	ed f	or M	ajor	s 1	.3	Graduat	e	1	Majo	or	0	
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В 11														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 1		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1		Means t			_	βh
				P 0 T 0		0-1						_	respons	es to b	e sign	ııııcar	1T	
				Τ 0		Otl	ner					5						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0801

24

COMPOSITION

BROFMAN, MARGAR

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 15

Page 657 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
			, 															
		General	L															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights,skil	lls from	n this course	0	0	1	1	4	4	5	3.73	1265/1481	3.87	4.16	4.29	4.14	3.73
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	1	1	1	4	8	4.13	934/1481	4.05	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.13
3. Did th	e exam qu	estions reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	9	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	810/1249	4.08	4.31	4.27	4.14	4.17
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	485/1424	4.16	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.47
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to v	what you learned	0	1	1	0	5	4	4	3.71	950/1396	3.65	4.05	3.98	3.89	3.71
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contri	bute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	474/1342	4.18	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.33
		g system clearly		ined	0	0	0	2	2	2	9	4.20	827/1459		4.05	4.16	4.17	4.20
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	1	14			1398/1480		4.44	4.68	4.64	3.93
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overal	ll teacl	ning effectiveness	2	0	1	0	3	6	3	3.77	1089/1450	4.08	4.15	4.09	3.97	3.77
	_	Lecture																
		ctor's lectures	_	_	1	0	1	2	4	5			1321/1409		4.29	4.42	4.36	3.36
		tor seem intere		_	1	0	1	0	0	5	8		1211/1407		4.68	4.69	4.57	4.36
				xplained clearly	1		1	1	1	7			1120/1399		4.28	4.26	4.23	3.86
		es contribute to			1	0	1	1	3	6			1190/1400		4.23	4.27	4.19	3.64
5. Did au	diovisual	. techniques enh	nance yo	our understanding	2	10	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1179	3.68	3.87	3.96	3.85	****
1 - 1		Discuss			_	0	0		-	0	_	0 56	1010/1060	2 02	4 00	4 05	2 55	0 56
				what you learned	6	0	2	4	1	0	2		1218/1262		4.28	4.05	3.77	2.56
		_	_	d to participate	6	0	1	1	2 1	3	2		1113/1259		4.53	4.29	4.06	3.44
				d open discussion	6	0 4	1 2	0	_	3	4	4.00	901/1256		4.56	4.30	4.08	4.00
4. were s	pecial te	chniques succes	SSIUI		6	4	2	U	3	0	0	2.20	779/ 788	3.66	3.97	4.00	3.80	2.20
				Freq	uency	y Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	 A 9		Re	guir	ed fo	 or M	 ajors		9	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 4			-			-						<b>J</b> -		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C 1		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D 0									J				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot]	her					6	-					
				? 1														

University of Maryland Page 658
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 11 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0901

COMPOSITION

MCGURRIN JR, AN

Title

Instructor:

	Questions								eque:	ncies 3	3	_		ructo			-		Level	
		Question 	s 			NK	NA				- <del>4</del> 		Mean	Rai	11K. 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1																	
1. Did you	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	2	0	0	3	1	1	5	1	3.00	1451/	1481	3.87	4.16	4.29	4.14	3.00
2. Did the	instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals		0	0	2	1	2	5	1	3.18	1397/	1481	4.05	4.23	4.23	4.18	3.18
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the ex	xpected goals	3	0	8	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1081/	1249	4.08	4.31	4.27	4.14	3.67
		ations reflect				0	1	2	2	1	2	3	3.20	1343/	1424	4.16	4.33	4.21	4.06	3.20
		eadings contrib				0	0	3	1	1	1	5	3.36	1154/	1396	3.65	4.05	3.98	3.89	3.36
		signments contr			earned	0	0	3	0	3	1			1202/		4.18	4.34	4.07	3.88	3.27
		g system clearl		ined		0	0	2	1	2	3	3	3.36	1309/	1459	3.92	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.36
		was class canc				0	2	0	1	0	8	0	3.78	1437/	1480	4.30	4.44	4.68	4.64	3.78
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiv	reness	2	1	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	997/	1450	4.08	4.15	4.09	3.97	3.88
		Lectur	е																	
1. Were th	e instru	ctor's lecture	s well ]	prepared		2	0	2	1	4	1	1	2.78	1385/	1409	4.07	4.29	4.42	4.36	2.78
2. Did the	instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	-	2	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1354/	1407	4.58	4.68	4.69	4.57	3.67
3. Was led	ture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained clea	arly	2	0	2	0	2	3	2	3.33	1277/	1399	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.23	3.33
4. Did the	lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	_	2	1	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	1283/	1400	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.19	3.25
5. Did aud	liovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understan	nding	3	7	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	1179	3.68	3.87	3.96	3.85	****
		Discus	sion																	
1. Did cla	ss discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you lear	rned	7	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	887/	1262	3.83	4.28	4.05	3.77	3.75
2. Were al	.l studer	nts actively en	courage	d to particip	pate	7	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1043/	1259	4.21	4.53	4.29	4.06	3.75
3. Did the	instruc	ctor encourage	fair and	d open discus	ssion	7	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	571/	1256	4.35	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.50
4. Were sp	ecial te	echniques succe	ssful	-		7	1	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	774/	788	3.66	3.97	4.00	3.80	2.33
		Self	Paced																	
1. Did sel	f-paced	system contrib	ute to	what you lear	rned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	55	****	3.32	4.55	4.48	****
					Freque	ency	Dist	rib	atio	n										
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected G	Grades				Rea	asons	:				Тур	ne			Majors	3
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 3			Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	jors	;	8	Gra	duate	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 5			_									, .	_			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 1			Gei	nera:	L				0	Und	er-gi	rad 1	.1	Non-	-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	•		-						_							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	-		Electives						0			Means t				jh
				P 0	•									res	ponse	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0			Otl	ner					2							

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1001 University of Maryland Page 659 COMPOSITION Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 MABE, MITZI J Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: Enrollment: 25

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	1	2	7	4	7	3.67	1299/1481	3.87	4.16	4.29	4.14	3.67
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	5	7	5	3.57	1296/1481	4.05	4.23	4.23	4.18	3.57
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1249	4.08	4.31	4.27	4.14	****
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	5	4	10	4.15	852/1424	4.16	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.15
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	7	1	4	4	2.85	1334/1396	3.65	4.05	3.98	3.89	2.85
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	5	9	3.86	920/1342	4.18	4.34	4.07	3.88	3.86
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	6	4	2	4	2.71	1416/1459	3.92	4.05	4.16	4.17	2.71
8.	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	702/1480	4.30	4.44	4.68	4.64	4.90
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	2	2	6	8	3	3.38	1272/1450	4.08	4.15	4.09	3.97	3.38
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	4	2	3	8	3	3.20	1344/1409	4.07	4.29	4.42	4.36	3.20
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	930/1407	4.58	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.70
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	6	7	3	3.35	1272/1399	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.23	3.35
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	6	2	7	3.45	1243/1400	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.19	3.45
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	2	0	2	2	0	2.67	1114/1179	3.68	3.87	3.96	3.85	2.67

#### 4. Were special techniques successful 10 3 0 3 2 2 3.50 604/ 788 3.66 3.97 4.00 3.80 3.50

Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0

2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate

Title

Ouestionnaires: 21

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	6	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	-			
				_	_						

10 0

0 0

Frequency Distribution

10

0

0

0 1 1

4 3.91 797/1262 3.83 4.28 4.05 3.77 3.91

9 4.73 391/1259 4.21 4.53 4.29 4.06 4.73

0 1 2 8 4.64 486/1256 4.35 4.56 4.30 4.08 4.64

Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1101

22

COMPOSITION

SIMON, BARBARA

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Page 660 JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								_	ncies				tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
		Genera	.1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	1031/1481	3.87	4.16	4.29	4.14	4.0
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	661/1481	4.05	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.4
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	4.08	4.31	4.27	4.14	***
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	334/1424	4.16	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.6
				what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	6	3		1136/1396		4.05	3.98	3.89	3.4
				to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	11	4.53	283/1342	4.18	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.5
		g system clearl		ained	0	0	0	0	1	5			425/1459		4.05	4.16	4.17	4.5
		was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	8			1072/1480		4.44	4.68	4.64	
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	.ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	651/1450	4.08	4.15	4.09	3.97	4.2
		Lectur	e															
L. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	633/1409	4.07	4.29	4.42	4.36	4.6
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	636/1407	4.58	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.8
. Was led	cture mat	explained clearly	2	0	1	1	0	3	8	4.23	846/1399	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.2		
. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	829/1400	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.19	4.3
5. Did aud	pid audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					4	0	2	2	3	2	3.56	877/1179	3.68	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.5
		Discus	sion															
l. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	708/1262	3.83	4.28	4.05	3.77	4.0
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	6	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	643/1259	4.21	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.4
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	636/1256	4.35	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.4
1. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		6	1	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	291/ 788	3.66	3.97	4.00	3.80	4.2
		Labora	tory															
L. Did the	e lab ind	crease understa	nding o	of the material	13	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	2.50	4.20	3.93	***
2. Were yo	ou provid	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 249	****	3.00	4.11	3.95	***
				for lab activities	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	3.00	4.40	4.33	***
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	5	
	27 7 0 00 0 00 0													- 				
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s 1	Τ	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В 7		_		_							_			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General							0	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		E10	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	ın
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	

Other

4

I

?

0

0

Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1201

22

COMPOSITION

PUTZEL, DIANE M

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Page 661 JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			M	3.7.3		equer			-		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect		
		Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did v	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	=	n this course	0	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	780/1481	3.87	4.16	4.29	4.14	4.30
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	12	8	4.40	661/1481	4.05	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.40
		uestions reflec	-		1	16	0	0	0	1	2		****/1249	4.08	4.31	4.27	4.14	****
	_	uations reflect		_	0	1	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	533/1424		4.33	4.21	4.06	4.42
				what you learned	0	2	0	3	5	6	4	3.61	1018/1396	3.65	4.05	3.98	3.89	3.61
	_	_		what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	270/1342	4.18	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.55
7. Was t	he grading	g system clearl	expla:	ined	0	0	1	0	1	8	10	4.30	732/1459	3.92	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.30
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	1	15	4	4.15	1288/1480	4.30	4.44	4.68	4.64	4.15
9. How w	ould you	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	375/1450	4.08	4.15	4.09	3.97	4.47
		Lecture	9															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well p	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	417/1409	4.07	4.29	4.42	4.36	4.75
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	500/1407	4.58	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.90
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	390/1399	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.65
		es contribute to	-		0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	433/1400		4.23	4.27	4.19	4.65
5. Did a	udiovisua	l techniques en	nance yo	our understanding	0	1	0	1	3	4	11	4.32	397/1179	3.68	3.87	3.96	3.85	4.32
		Discus																
				what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	467/1262		4.28	4.05	3.77	
				d to participate	4	0	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	489/1259	4.21	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.63
		_		d open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	357/1256		4.56	4.30	4.08	4.75
4. Were	special to	echniques succe	ssiul		4	2	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	308/ 788	3.66	3.97	4.00	3.80	4.21
				_		<u> </u>	,											
				Frequ	ency	DIST	trib	ltloi	1									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quir	ed fo	or M	 ajor	 s 1	.8	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	в 14			_			-						,		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	0	Non-	-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	ιh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her					1						
				? 1														

University of Maryland Page 662
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1301

23

COMPOSITION

FINDLAY, JOANNE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

			Fre	eaue	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
<b>~</b> ************************************														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	5	5	4	3.53	1351/1481	3.87	4.16	4.29	4.14	3.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	3	9	4.06	979/1481	4.05	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	718/1249	4.08	4.31	4.27	4.14	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	818/1424	4.16	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	7	4	3.65	998/1396	3.65	4.05	3.98	3.89	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	4	7	4.00	755/1342	4.18	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	6	3	7		1013/1459	3.92	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	4	12	1	0		1477/1480	4.30	4.44	4.68	4.64	2.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	6	5		836/1450		4.15	4.09	3.97	
y. Now would you grade one everall beaching crieborychess	_	Ü	Ü	-		·	_	1.00	000,1100	1.00	1.15	1.05	3.7	1.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	4	6	3	3 60	1281/1409	4.07	4.29	4.42	4.36	3.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	6	7		1221/1407	4.58	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	4	5	4		1170/1399	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.23	3.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	4	4	_		1067/1400		4.23	4.27	4.19	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	1	1	0	0	0		****/1179		3.87		3.85	****
5. Did additivisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	Τ	Τ	U	U	U	1.50	/11/9	3.00	3.07	3.90	3.03	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	507/1262	3.83	4.28	4.05	3.77	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	588/1259	4.21	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	<i>5</i>	6	4.42	669/1256	4.35	4.56	4.29	4.08	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	5 5	3	0	0	3	3	3		394/ 788		3.97			4.42
4. were special techniques successful	5	3	U	U	3	3	3	4.00	394/ /88	3.00	3.97	4.00	3.80	4.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 249	****	2 00	4.11	2 0 5	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	Τ0	U	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	***/ 249		3.00	4.11	3.95	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 68	****	4.72	4.49	4.54	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 69	****	4.75	4.49	4.18	****
	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 63	****				****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	Τ		****/ 69	****	4.33	4.44	$4.17 \\ 4.14$	****
-		0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 68	****		4.35		****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	U	U	Τ	U	U	U	2.00	^^^^	^ ^ ^ ^	4.03	3.92	3.80	^ ^ ^ ^
mi al di manda														
Field Work	1.0	0	^	^	0	0	1	F 00	****/ FO	444	0 00	4 20	4 00	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 59	***	2.00	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 51	****	2.00	4.00	3.44	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****
- 10 - 1														
Self Paced	1.0		•	•		-	0	4 00		also also also al	2 26	4 55	4 46	ate ate ate at
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 55	***	3.32	4.55	4.48	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 51		4.31	4.65	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	4.14	4.83	4.67	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	***	****	4.82	4.58	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1301
Title COMPOSITION
Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNE

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 662 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

#### Frequency Distribution

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1501 University of Maryland Page 663
Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	20						
Questionnaires:	15	Student	Course	Eva:	luation	Questionnaire	

							Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil	_	this course	0	0	1	1	4	4	5	3.73	1265/1481	3.87	4.16	4.29	4.14	3.73
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	399/1481	4.05	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.60
		estions reflect	_	_	0	2	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	470/1249	4.08	4.31	4.27	4.14	4.54
	_	ations reflect			0	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	874/1424	4.16	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.13
			_	hat you learned	0	2	0	1	1	10	1	3.85	846/1396		4.05	3.98	3.89	3.85
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	283/1342	4.18	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.53
7. Was th	e grading	system clearly	y explai	ned	1	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	298/1459	3.92	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.64
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1480	4.30	4.44	4.68	4.64	5.00
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	2	0	0	2	2	6	3	3.77	1089/1450	4.08	4.15	4.09	3.97	3.77
		Tash	_															
1 Woro +	ho inatro	Lecture		2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	514/1409	4.07	4.29	4.42	4.36	4.69	
			s lectures well prepared eem interested in the subject					1	1	1	10		1084/1407	4.58	4.68	4.42	4.57	4.54
			presented and explained clearly					1	1	2	9	4.46	613/1399	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.46
		_			2	0	0 1	1	0	6	5		1017/1400		4.23	4.27	4.19	4.00
			ribute to what you learned				0	0	3	4	6		457/1179		3.87			4.23
5. Did au	laiovisuai	t techniques em	lance yo	ur understanding	2	0	U	U	3	-1	0	4.23	457/1179	3.00	3.07	3.90	3.03	4.23
		Discus	sion															
				hat you learned	5	0	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	913/1262	3.83	4.28	4.05	3.77	3.70
2. Were a	ıll studer	nts actively end	couraged	to participate	5	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	821/1259	4.21	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.20
				open discussion	5	0	1	1	0	1	7	4.20	809/1256		4.56	4.30	4.08	4.20
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	ssful		5	2	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	659/ 788	3.66	3.97	4.00	3.80	3.38
				Freq	iencs	/ Dist	trib	ıt i oı	n									
				1104	201107	210	0110											
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	 7	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Red	quir	ed f	or M	 ajor	 s	7	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 3			-			_						<b>J</b> -		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	5	Non-	-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D 0									3				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoue	<sub>j</sub> h
				P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Ot1	her					6	-					
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1601 University of Maryland Page 664 COMPOSITION Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 PUTZEL, DIANE M Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

22

							Fr	eque:	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	870/1481	3.87	4.16	4.29	4.14	4.24
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	493/1481		4.23	4.23	4.18	4.53
		uestions reflec			0	13	0	0	0	0	4		****/1249		4.31	4.27	4.14	****
	_	uations reflect		1 3	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41			4.33	4.21	4.06	4.41
				what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	297/1396		4.05	3.98	3.89	4.50
	_			o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	251/1342	4.18	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.59
		g system clearl		-	0	0	1	0	1	3	12	4.47	505/1459	3.92	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.47
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	12	5	4.29	1185/1480	4.30	4.44	4.68	4.64	4.29
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	334/1450	4.08	4.15	4.09	3.97	4.50
1 77	1	Lectur			_	^	_	^	1	_	1 1	4 76	400/1400	4 07	4 00	4 40	4 26	4 76
		uctor's lecture		0	0	0	0	Ţ	2	14	4.76	400/1409		4.29	4.42	4.36	4.76	
		ctor seem inter	3	0	0	0	0	0		15	4.88	545/1407		4.68	4.69	4.57	4.88	
		_	xplained clearly	0	0	0		0	4	13		256/1399		4.28	4.26	4.23	4.76	
		es contribute t		-	0	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	766/1400		4.23	4.27	4.19	4.35
5. Did au	diovisua.	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	283/1179	3.68	3.87	3.96	3.85	4.47
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	381/1262	3.83	4.28	4.05	3.77	4.47
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	2	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	509/1259	4.21	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.60
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	296/1256	4.35	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.80
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		2	3	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	176/ 788	3.66	3.97	4.00	3.80	4.50
				Frequ	enas	, Dia	trib	ut i o	n									
				riequ	ency	DIS	CIID	ucio.										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	guir	ed f	or M	aior	s 1	.4	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r •	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	В 8			1				-		- 210101010	-	-			_	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0									5				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		El	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	<sub>j</sub> h
				P 0									respons				_	
				I O		Ot1	her					3	-		5			
												-						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1901

22

COMPOSITION

MACEK, PHILIP

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 20

Page 665 JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								_	ncie	s			tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Question	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did v	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	n this course	2	0	0	0	3	12	3	4.00	1069/1481	3.87	4.16	4.29	4.14	4.00
		ctor make clear			2	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	386/1481	4.05	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.61
		uestions reflec	_	_	2	14	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1249	4.08	4.31	4.27	4.14	****
	_	uations reflect		_	2	1	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	416/1424		4.33	4.21	4.06	4.53
				what you learned	3	5	1	4	2	3	2		1276/1396		4.05	3.98	3.89	3.08
				what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	527/1342	4.18	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.28
		g system clearl			2	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17			4.05	4.16	4.17	4.17
		was class canc			2	0	0	0	0	16	2		1316/1480		4.44	4.68	4.64	4.11
				ning effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47			4.15	4.09		4.47
J. 110	ouzu you :	grade 0110 0 vera	0000	ing cricocryoness	J	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	•			3,3,1130	1.00	1.10	2.03	3.3.	1.17
1		Lectur	,	_	•	0	•	0	2	7.4	4 00	204/1400	4 0 0	4 00	4 40	4 26	4 00	
		uctor's lecture			3	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	,		4.29	4.42	4.36	4.82
		ctor seem inter		3	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1407	4.58	4.68	4.69	4.57	5.00	
				xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82			4.28	4.26	4.23	4.82
		es contribute t		•	3	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	- ,		4.23	4.27	4.19	4.53
5. Did a	udiovisua	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	3	10	5	0	1	1	0	1.71	1174/1179	3.68	3.87	3.96	3.85	1.71
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to v	what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	563/1262	3.83	4.28	4.05	3.77	4.27
2. Were	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	304/1259	4.21	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.80
3. Did t	he instru	ctor encourage	fair and	d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	151/1256	4.35	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.93
4. Were	special to	echniques succe	ssful		6	9	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	318/ 788	3.66	3.97	4.00	3.80	4.20
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits	Farned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Pο	ason	c c			Ty	ne			Majors	
										. <del>-</del>								
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 1	.3	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 9														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C 1		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	20	Non-	-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					5	_					
				? 0														

University of Maryland Page 666
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100 2101

21

COMPOSITION

BROFMAN, MARGAR

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 21

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
			Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			Genera	 1															
1 1	744	anin no	Genera w insights,ski	_	m this source	14	0	0	2	2	1	2	2 12	1380/1481	3.87	4.16	4.29	4.14	3.43
	_	_	tor make clear			14	0	1	2	1	2	1		1420/1481	4.05	4.10	4.23	4.14	3.43
			estions reflec		_	14	4	1	0	0	2	0		****/1249		4.23	4.23	4.16	****
		_	ations reflect		_	14	0	0	2	0	2	2		1123/1424		4.33	4.21	4.14	3.86
					what you learned	14	0	0	3	2	1	1		1292/1396		4.05	3.98	3.89	3.00
		_	_		what you learned o what you learned		0	0	2	0	2	7		920/1342		4.34	4.07	3.88	3.86
			system clearly			14	0	2	0	1	3	1		1360/1459		4.05	4.16	4.17	3.14
			was class canc		Inea	14	0	0	0	0	3 7	_		1349/1480		4.44	4.16	4.17	4.00
	_				hing effectiveness		2	0	2	1	0			****/1450		4.15	4.00	3.97	****
9. 1	HOW WOUL	a you gi	rade the overa	II teac	ning effectiveness	5 15	2	U	2	Т	U	Τ	3.00	***/1450	4.08	4.15	4.09	3.97	
			Lectur	e															
1. 1	Were the	instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	15	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1270/1409	4.07	4.29	4.42	4.36	3.67
			tor seem inter		15	0	0	0	3	2	1		1354/1407		4.68	4.69	4.57	3.67	
				xplained clearly	15	0	0	1	1	3	1		1196/1399		4.28	4.26	4.23	3.67	
			s contribute to		15	0	1	1	1	3	0		1312/1400		4.23	4.27	4.19	3.00	
					our understanding	15	4	0	0	1	1	0		****/1179		3.87	3.96	3.85	****
			1																
			Discus	sion															
1. 1	Did clas	s discus	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	15	0	2	1	2	0	1	2.50	1223/1262	3.83	4.28	4.05	3.77	2.50
2. 1	Were all	student	ts actively en	courage	d to participate	15	0	1	2	2	0	1	2.67	1221/1259	4.21	4.53	4.29	4.06	2.67
3. 1	Did the	instruct	tor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	15	0	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	1200/1256	4.35	4.56	4.30	4.08	2.83
4. 1	Were spe	cial te	chniques succe	ssful		15	4	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	3.66	3.97	4.00	3.80	****
					Free	quency	/ Dis	trib	ution	n									
Cred	dits Ear	ned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	5			Rea	asons	5			ТУ	pe			Majors	\$
	 -27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 0					 or Ma	iors		4	Graduat		0	Majo	~~~~~	0
	-27 -55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B 5		Ke	quir	eu r	JI Mc	ijors		4	Graduat	<b>C</b>	U	Majo	)T	U
	-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Ge.	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad ?	21	Non-	major	21
	-03 -150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		GE.	шста.	_				J	onder -g.	ruu 2		INOII	iia jui	21
Gra		0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		E1.	ecti	ves.				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
OI		•	3.30 1.00	J	P 0		11.1	CCCI	v CD				J	respons				_	,
					I O		O+.	her					3	I CSPOIIS		,c 5191.	cai		
					± 0		UL.	TICT					J						

?

0

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0101 University of Maryland Page 667
Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	26		
Questionnaires:	19	Student Course	Evaluation Questionnaire

			]	Freq	quen	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	Α :	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	(	0	Λ	0	1	10	R	4.37	718/1481	3.77	4.16	4.29	4.14	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0		-	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	493/1481	4.32	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13		0	0	1	3	2	4.17	810/1249		4.31	4.27	4.14	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	(		0	0	2	4	13	4.58	364/1424		4.33	4.21	4.06	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	l 0	(	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	121/1396	3.83	4.05	3.98	3.89	4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learn	ed 0	(	0	0	0	4	3	12	4.42	384/1342	4.22	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	(	0	0	0	2	11	6	4.21	809/1459	4.22	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	(	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1480	4.21	4.44	4.68	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivene	ess 4	(	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	259/1450	4.02	4.15	4.09	3.97	4.60
Lecture	0	,	0	0	1	1	_	11	4 40	865/1409	4.39	4.29	4 40	1 20	4 40
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	(		0 0	0	0	2	11 17	4.42	522/1409	4.39	4.29	4.42	4.36 4.57	4.42 4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly		(		0	1	1	9	8	4.09	819/1399		4.08	4.09	4.23	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0			0	0	0	6	13	4.68	397/1400		4.23	4.27	4.19	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		12		1	1	2	2	1		1027/1179		3.87	3.96		3.14
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19 0	12	۷.	_	_	2	2	_	3.14	1027/1179	3.42	3.07	3.90	3.03	3.11
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	l 6	(	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	249/1262	4.03	4.28	4.05	3.77	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		(	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	451/1259	4.31	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		(		0	0	0	2	11	4.85	264/1256		4.56	4.30	4.08	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	4 :	2	0	1	4	2	3.44	631/ 788	4.00	3.97	4.00	3.80	3.44
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	(	0	0	0	0	Ο	1	5 00	****/ 246	****	2.50	4.20	3.93	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background informati		(	-	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 249	****	3.00	4.11	3.95	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activitie		(	-	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 242	****	3.00	4.40	4.33	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	Ċ	-	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240		3.50	4.20	4.20	***
•															
Fr	equency	y Di	istr	ibut	tion	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad	les				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C			0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				2	0						

University of Maryland Page 668
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0201

25

COMPOSITION

BROFMAN, MARGAR

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 15

								-	ncie	s .	_		tructor	Course	_			Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	3	1	4	4	3	3.20	1426/1481	3.77	4.16	4.29	4.14	3.20
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	3	8	3	3.87	1142/1481	4.32	4.23	4.23	4.18	3.87
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	6	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	988/1249	4.03	4.31	4.27	4.14	3.89
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	7	5	3	3.73	1197/1424	4.15	4.33	4.21	4.06	3.73
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	2	1	4	2	3	2	3.08	1276/1396	3.83	4.05	3.98	3.89	3.08
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	2	8	4.14	649/1342	4.22	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.14
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	460/1459	4.22	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.50
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	14	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.21	4.44	4.68	4.64	4.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	2	0	1	4	1	5	3.91	973/1450	4.02	4.15	4.09	3.97	3.91
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	1	0	4	4	5	3.86	1228/1409	4.39	4.29	4.42	4.36	3.86
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	1053/1407	4.75	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.57
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	1	2	1	4	6	3.86	1120/1399	4.32	4.28	4.26	4.23	3.86
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	1	1	0	5	2	5	3.77	1140/1400	4.26	4.23	4.27	4.19	3.77
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	6	2	1	3	1	1	2.75	1104/1179	3.42	3.87	3.96	3.85	2.75
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	1	2	2	3	2	3.30	1070/1262	4.03	4.28	4.05	3.77	3.30
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	5	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	751/1259	4.31	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.30
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	5	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	860/1256	4.37	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.10
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		6	3	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	254/ 788	4.00	3.97	4.00	3.80	4.33
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	S			Ty	pe			Majors	<b>;</b>
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A 4		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 1	.0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В 6		~		,				0	1		_			1.5
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 4		Ge	nera	T				0	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0								0			1			1.
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	ın
				1 0		0+1	1					4	respons	es to E	e sign	ııııcar	16	
				5 0 I 0		Ut.	her					4						
				? 0														

COMPOSITION COLLINS, ELSA Spring 2006

Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires: 23

25

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 669

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0301 University of Maryland Title Instructor:

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 2 3 7 6 5 3.39 1389/1481 3.77 4.16 4.29 4.14 3.39 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 6 8 8 4.00 1000/1481 4.32 4.23 4.23 4.18 4.00 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 12 0 1 5 1 3 3.60 1096/1249 4.03 4.31 4.27 4.14 3.60 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 1 1 0 4 9 7 4.00 959/1424 4.15 4.33 4.21 4.06 4.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 4 4 5 5 4 3.05 1284/1396 3.83 4.05 3.98 3.89 3.05 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 5 9 8 4.04 731/1342 4.22 4.34 4.07 3.88 4.04 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 2 3 6 12 4.22 809/1459 4.22 4.05 4.16 4.17 4.22 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 21 5.00 1/1480 4.21 4.44 4.68 4.64 5.009. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 1 7 5 3 3.63 1179/1450 4.02 4.15 4.09 3.97 3.63 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 0 3 4 14 4.52 739/1409 4.39 4.29 4.42 4.36 4.52 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 4 17 4.73 880/1407 4.75 4.68 4.69 4.57 4.73 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 1 10 9 4.40 683/1399 4.32 4.28 4.26 4.23 4.40 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 2 2 8 8 4.10 985/1400 4.26 4.23 4.27 4.19 4.10 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 9 1 1 2 4 3 3.64 850/1179 3.42 3.87 3.96 3.85 3.64 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 2 1 4 3 3 3.31 1070/1262 4.03 4.28 4.05 3.77 3.31 0 6 3 3 3.54 1089/1259 4.31 4.53 4.29 4.06 3.54 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 1 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 1 0 4 5 3 3.69 1061/1256 4.37 4.56 4.30 4.08 3.69 4. Were special techniques successful 10 5 0 0 6 1 1 3.38 659/788 4.00 3.97 4.00 3.80 3.38 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 22 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 \*\*\*\*/ 249 \*\*\*\* 3.00 4.11 3.95 \*\*\*\* Field Work 0 0 0 1.00 \*\*\*\*/ 59 \*\*\*\* 2.00 4.30 4.00 \*\*\*\* 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 22 0 1 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 22 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 \*\*\*\*/ 51 \*\*\*\* 2.00 4.00 3.44 \*\*\*\* Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 \*\*\*\*/ 55 \*\*\*\* 3.32 4.55 4.48 \*\*\*\* Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 1.00-1.99 0 B 11 2.00-2.99 4 C 3 00-27 Required for Majors 17 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 4 General 0 Under-grad 23 Non-major 23 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 D 1 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 2

? 0

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0401 University of Maryland Page 670 Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006

Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNE (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 21

Spring 2006
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

									Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			Question	s			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			 Genera	 1																
1. Di	d you	gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this cou	rse	0	0	0	1	7	6	7	3.90	1162/1481	3.77	4.16	4.29	4.14	3.90
2. Di	d the	instruc	tor make clear	the ex	spected goa	ls	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	560/1481	4.32	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.48
3. Di	d the	exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	expected go	als	0	9	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	742/1249	4.03	4.31	4.27	4.14	4.25
4. Di	d othe	r evalu	ations reflect	the ex	spected goa	ls	0	1	0	1	1	10	8	4.25	740/1424	4.15	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.25
5. Di	d assi	gned re	adings contrib	ute to	what you 1	earned	0	0	0	1	4	8	8	4.10	649/1396	3.83	4.05	3.98	3.89	4.10
6. Di	d writ	ten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you	learned	0	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	474/1342	4.22	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.33
7. Wa	s the	grading	system clearl	y expla	ained		0	0	0	0	6	8	7	4.05	940/1459	4.22	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.05
8. Ho	w many	times	was class canc	elled			0	0	1	1	15	2	2	3.14	1464/1480	4.21	4.44	4.68	4.64	3.14
9. Ho	w woul	d you g	rade the overa	ll tead	ching effec	tiveness	2	0	0	1	1	7	10	4.37	515/1450	4.02	4.15	4.09	3.97	4.18
1. We	ere the	instru		1	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	762/1409	4.39	4.29	4.42	4.36	4.50			
2. Di	d the	instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subj	ect	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	728/1407	4.75	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.80
3. Wa	s lect	ure mat	erial presente	d and e	explained c	learly	1	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	513/1399	4.32	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.55
4. Di	d the	lecture	s contribute t	o what	you learne	d	1	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	541/1400	4.26	4.23	4.27	4.19	4.55
5. Di	d audi	ovisual	techniques en	hance y	our unders	tanding	2	10	0	2	4	0	3	3.44	924/1179	3.42	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.44
			Discus	sion																
1. Di	d clas	s discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you l	earned	4	0	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	624/1262	4.03	4.28	4.05	3.77	4.18
2. We	ere all	studen	nts actively en	courage	ed to parti	cipate	4	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	715/1259	4.31	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.35
3. Di	d the	instruc	tor encourage	fair ar	nd open dis	cussion	4	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	477/1256	4.37	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.65
4. We	ere spe	cial te	chniques succe	ssful	-		4	3	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	347/ 788	4.00	3.97	4.00	3.80	4.14
						Frequ	ıency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Crodi	ts Ear	nod	Cum. GPA		Exporto	d Grades				D.O.	ason	a			Ту	no			Majors	
crear	.us Edf	eu	Cuiii. GPA		Expecte.					же 	ason				1 Y.	 he			majors	, 
00-2		8	0.00-0.99	0	A	5		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 1	.2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-5		5	1.00-1.99	0	В	12														
56-8	3	1	2.00-2.99	8	C	4		Gei	nerai	1				0	Under-q	rad 2	:1	Non-	major	21

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	8	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0401 University of Maryland Page 671 Title Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 COMPOSITION Job IRBR3029

Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNE (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 21

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

Ρ

I

0

0

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Fre	eque	ncie	s		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 voi	u gain ne		ls from this course	0	0	0	1	7	6	7	3.90	1162/1481	3.77	4.16	4.29	4.14	3.90
			the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	560/1481	4.32	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.48
			the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	742/1249	4.03	4.31	4.27	4.14	4.25
4. Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect	the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	10	8	4.25	740/1424	4.15	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.25
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contribu	te to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	8	8	4.10	649/1396	3.83	4.05	3.98	3.89	4.10
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contri	bute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	474/1342	4.22	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.33
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	explained	0	0	0	0	6	8	7	4.05	940/1459	4.22	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.05
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	lled	0	0	1	1	15	2	2	3.14	1464/1480	4.21	4.44	4.68	4.64	3.14
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overal	l teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	836/1450	4.02	4.15	4.09	3.97	4.18
		Lecture															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lectures		18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1409	4.39	4.29	4.42	4.36	4.50
			sted in the subject	18	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/1407		4.68	4.69	4.57	4.80
			and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1399	4.32	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.55
		_	what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1400	4.26	4.23	4.27	4.19	4.55
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques enh	ance your understanding	18	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/1179	3.42	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.44
		Discuss															
1 Did al-	ann dinn		ton te to what you learned	4	0	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	624/1262	4.03	4.28	4.05	3.77	4.18
			ouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	-		4.35	715/1259		4.53	4.29	4.06	4.35
		-	air and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2		13	4.65	477/1256		4.56	4.30	4.08	4.65
		echniques succes	_	4	3	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	,		3.97	4.00		4.14
			Freq	uency	7 Dist	crib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors		
00-27	00-27 8 0.00-0.99 0 A 5						 ed f	or M	 aior	s 1	2	Graduat	 e	0	 Majo	 r	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0 B 12		1.0.						=	2_ 34440	-	-	- 100 ) 0	_	,
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	8 C 4		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	1	Non-	major	21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4 D 0													-	

Electives

Other

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title COMPOSITION Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0601

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 20

Page 672 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	4	4	9	3.85	1193/1481	3.77	4.16	4.29	4.14	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	458/1481	4.32	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	5	3	7	4.00	893/1249	4.03	4.31	4.27	4.14	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	5	3	9	4.11	896/1424	4.15	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	3	10	3.85	839/1396	3.83	4.05	3.98	3.89	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	5	10	4.05	725/1342	4.22	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	6	11	4.30	732/1459	4.22	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	421/1480	4.21	4.44	4.68	4.64	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1189/1450	4.02	4.15	4.09	3.97	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	4		4.63	618/1409	4.39	4.29	4.42	4.36	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	804/1407	4.75	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	545/1399	4.32	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	1	4		4.18	929/1400	4.26	4.23	4.27	4.19	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	549/1179	3.42	3.87	3.96	3.85	4.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	325/1262		4.28	4.05	3.77	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	480/1259	4.31	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	4	0	7	4.27	760/1256	4.37	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	159/ 788	4.00	3.97	4.00	3.80	4.57
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 246	****	2.50	4.20	3.93	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 249	****	3.00	4.11	3.95	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 242	****	3.00	4.40	4.33	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 240	****	3.50	4.20	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.72	4.49	4.54	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 69	****	4.75	4.53	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.33	4.44	4.17	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.71	4.35	4.14	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.03	3.92	3.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 59	****	2.00	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 51	****	2.00	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	***	4.42	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.32	4.55	4.48	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.56	4.75	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.31	4.65	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.14	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0601
Title COMPOSITION
Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2006

Page 672 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

#### Frequency Distribution

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	 А	15	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	С	0	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN

Title Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 9

Spring 2006

Page 673 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			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
General	_			_	_		_							
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	4	1		1315/1481		4.16	4.29	4.14	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	693/1481	4.44		4.23	4.18	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	810/1249	4.08	4.31	4.27	4.14	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	885/1424	4.06		4.21	4.06	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	0	1			1011/1396	3.88	4.05	3.98	3.89	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	2		3.75	987/1342	3.94	4.34	4.07	3.88	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	0	3			1154/1459	4.06		4.16	4.17	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6			1215/1480	4.25	4.44	4.68	4.64	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	836/1450	4.08	4.15	4.09	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	2	4	4 13	1110/1409	4.13	4.29	4.42	4.36	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	2	5		1200/1407	4.31	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	2		4.38	713/1399	4.31	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	-	4.38	741/1400	4.25	4.23	4.27	4.19	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	1	1		3.83	739/1179	3.77	3.87		3.85	3.83
J. Did additivisdal techniques emiance your understanding	2	_	Τ.	U	_	1	J	3.03	735/1175	3.77	3.07	3.90	3.03	3.03
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	949/1262	3.81	4.28	4.05	3.77	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	2	0	2	4	4.00	895/1259	4.21	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	2	0	1	5	4.13	848/1256	4.21	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	713/ 788	3.25	3.97	4.00	3.80	3.00
- 1														
Laboratory	0	•	•	-	•	0	•	0 00		0 50	0 50	4 00	2 02	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 246	2.50	2.50	4.20	3.93	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 249	3.00	3.00	4.11	3.95	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 68	****	4.72	4.49	4.54	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	4.75	4.53	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 63	****	4.33	4.44	4.17	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 69	****	4.71	4.35	4.14	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 68	****		3.92	3.80	****
or note official for grading made official	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	1.00	, 33		1.05	3.72	3.00	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	2.00	2.00	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	2.00	2.00	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	***	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****
Self Paced														
	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2 00	****/	2 00	2 21	/ EE	1 10	****
<ol> <li>Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Did study questions make clear the expected goal</li> </ol>	8	0	0	1 1	0	0	0		****/ 55 ****/ 31	3.00 3.00	3.32 3.56	4.55 4.75	4.48 4.42	****
	8	0	1	0	0	0	0			3.00 ****				****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51 ****/ 34	****	4.31	4.65	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	1		-	0	0		,	****	4.14	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	U	Τ	0	0	U	U	1.00	****/ 24			4.82	4.58	

Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN

Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 673 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

#### Frequency Distribution

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

COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN

Title

Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 8

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 674 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	844/1481		4.16	4.29	4.14	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	517/1481	4.44	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	893/1249	4.08	4.31	4.27	4.14	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3		4.00	,		4.33	4.21	4.06	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2			623/1396	3.88	4.05	3.98	3.89	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2		4.13	672/1342	3.94	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3			647/1459		4.05	4.16	4.17	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6			1215/1480	4.25	4.44	4.68	4.64	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	722/1450	4.08	4.15	4.09	3.97	4.17
T a shows														
Lecture	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	1 12	1110/1400	1 12	4 00	4 40	1 20	1 12
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0 0	0	0	2 2	3 2	3 4		1110/1409 1257/1407	4.13 4.31	4.29 4.68	4.42 4.69	4.36 4.57	4.13 4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	_	4.25	828/1399	4.31	4.08	4.09	4.23	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2		4.13	969/1400	4.25	4.23	4.20	4.19	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	2	2	2		820/1179	3.77	3.87	3.96		3.71
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	Τ.	U		4	4	_	3.11	020/11/9	3.11	3.07	3.90	3.03	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	708/1262	3.81	4.28	4.05	3.77	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	661/1259	4.21	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	754/1256	4.21	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	604/ 788	3.25	3.97	4.00	3.80	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	246/ 246	2.50	2.50	4.20	3.93	2.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	230/ 249	3.00	3.00	4.11	3.95	3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	240/ 242	3.00	3.00	4.40	4.33	3.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	199/ 240	3.50	3.50	4.20	4.20	3.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 68	****	4.72	4.49	4.54	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	4.75	4.53	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	4.33	4.44	4.17	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.71	4.35	4.14	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.03	3.92	3.80	****
11 ··· 1														
Field Work	_	0		0	-	0	0	0 00	F0 / F0	0 00	0 00	4 20	4 00	0 00
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	59/ 59	2.00	2.00	4.30	4.00	2.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	47/ 51	2.00	2.00	4.00	3.44	2.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	1	0	U	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	^^^	^ ^ ^ ^	4.42	* * * * *	^ ^ ^ ^
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	50/ 55	3.00	3.32	4.55	4.48	3.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	31/ 31	3.00		4.75	4.48	3.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 51	****	3.56 4.31	4.75	4.42	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	4.14	4.83	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 24		****	4.82	4.58	****
5. Here there chough proceeds for all the seadenes	U	_	O	U	_	U	U	3.00	, 21			1.02	1.50	

Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN

Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 674 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

#### Frequency Distribution

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

Title INTRO TO LITERATURE

Instructor: FITZPATRICK, VI

Enrollment: 37 Questionnaires: 19 Spring 2006

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 675 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions		NR	NA	Fre	eque:	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	
		General															
1. Did	vou gain	new insights, skills fro	m this course	0	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	1006/1481	4.11	4.16	4.29	4.40	4.11
	-	uctor make clear the ex		0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	361/1481		4.23	4.23	4.29	4.63
		questions reflect the e		0	0	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	655/1249		4.31	4.27	4.36	4.37
		luations reflect the ex		1	1	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	762/1424		4.33	4.21	4.28	4.24
		readings contribute to		0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	177/1396	4.68	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.68
6. Did	written a	ssignments contribute t	o what you learned	0	1	2	1	2	5	8	3.89	898/1342	3.89	4.34	4.07	4.05	3.89
7. Was	the gradi	ng system clearly expla	ined	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	310/1459	4.63	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.63
8. How	many time	s was class cancelled		1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	421/1480	4.94	4.44	4.68	4.68	4.94
9. How	would you	grade the overall tead	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	5	5	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.15	4.09	4.15	4.00
		Lecture															
1. Were	e the inst	ructor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	367/1409	4.79	4.29	4.42	4.47	4.79
2. Did	the instr	uctor seem interested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	300/1407	4.95	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.95
3. Was	lecture m	aterial presented and e	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	545/1399	4.53	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.53
		res contribute to what		0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	456/1400	4.63	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.63
5. Did	audiovisu	al techniques enhance y	our understanding	1	0	2	4	4	2	6	3.33	972/1179	3.33	3.87	3.96	4.05	3.33
1. Did	Discussion id class discussions contribute to what you learr				0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	788/1262	3.92	4.28	4.05	4.11	3.92
2. Were	e all stud	ents actively encourage	ed to participate	8	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	556/1259	4.55	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.55
	ere all students actively encouraged to participa id the instructor encourage fair and open discuss				0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	357/1256		4.56	4.30	4.28	4.75
4. Were	e special	techniques successful		7	8	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 788	****	3.97	4.00	3.98	****
		Laboratory															
2. Were	e you prov	ided with adequate back	ground information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	3.00	4.11	4.32	****
		Field Work															
1. Did	field exp	erience contribute to w	hat you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	2.00	4.30	4.67	****
		ly understand your eval		18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	2.00	4.00	4.07	****
3. Was	the instr	uctor available for con	sultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.64	****
4. To w	what degre	e could you discuss you	ır evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41		****	4.26	4.69	****
5. Did	conferenc	es help you carry out f	ield activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.80	****
		Self Paced															
1. Did	self-pace	d system contribute to	what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	***	3.32	4.55	4.44	****
2. Did	study que	stions make clear the e	expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.56	4.75	4.50	****
3. Were	e your con	tacts with the instruct	or helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 51	****	4.31	4.65	4.66	****
4. Was	the feedb	ack/tutoring by proctor	s helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34		4.14	4.83	4.43	****
5. Were	e there en	ough proctors for all t	he students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****
		Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad						Rea	asons	3			Τv	ре			Majors	}
00-27	2 3	0.00-0.99 0 1.00-1.99 0	A 7 B 10		Re	quire	ed f	or Ma	Jor	S	4	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	8-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 10 6-83 2 2.00-2.99 4 C 1				<b>a</b>		1				1	IIndor -	d 1	0	Mon	mo i o	1.0
	-83 2 2.00-2.99 4 C 1 -150 5 3.00-3.49 3 D 0					nera:	т				1	Under-g	ıau l	.9	MOIJ-	-major	19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	D 0 F 0		. רים	ectiv	765				0	#### -	Means +	here -	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00 0	P 0		11.1	CCLI	vca				J	respons				_	111
			I 0		Ot1	her				1	.1	I CBPOIIS		, 5191	cai		
			3 0		00					_	-						

Course-Section: ENGL 210B 0101 INTRO TO LITERATURE Instructor: KENDALL, GEORGE

Title

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 41

50

University of Maryland Page 676 Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

			and the second second
Ctudant	Course	Fraluation	Ouestionnaire

								eque:					tructor	Course	_			
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	1	0	1	2	5	16	16	4.10	1006/1481	4.10	4.16	4.29	4.40	4.10
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	3	1	15	22	4.37	704/1481	4.37	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.37
		uestions reflec			1	0	0	2	2	15	21	4.38	647/1249	4.38	4.31	4.27	4.36	4.38
	_	uations reflect		_	2	1	3	0	3	14	18	4.16	852/1424	4.16	4.33	4.21	4.28	4.16
				what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	10	25	4.51	291/1396	4.51	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.51
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	2	0	0	1	9	11	18	4.18	615/1342	4.18	4.34	4.07	4.05	4.18
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	3	0	1	1	2	6	28	4.55	402/1459	4.55	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.55
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		3	0	0	0	0	27	11	4.29	1193/1480	4.29	4.44	4.68	4.68	4.29
				hing effectiveness	6	1	0	2	1	12	19	4.41	459/1450	4.41	4.15	4.09	4.15	4.41
1. Were t						0	1	1	1	11	25	4.49	787/1409	4.49	4.29	4.42	4.47	4.49
	re the instructor's lectures well prepared the instructor seem interested in the subject				2	0	0	1	0		32	4.77	804/1407	4.77	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.77
				xplained clearly		0	0	1	4	9	25	4.49	590/1399	4.49	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.49
		es contribute t			2	0	1	1	1	10	26	4.51	581/1400		4.23	4.27	4.34	4.51
				our understanding	1	23	4	5	2	1	5		1089/1179		3.87			2.88
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	310/1262	4.57	4.28	4.05	4.11	4.57
				d to participate	27	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57			4.53	4.29	4.34	4.57
				d open discussion	27	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	406/1256	4.71	4.56	4.30	4.28	4.71
		echniques succe			27	8	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	****/ 788	***	3.97	4.00	3.98	****
				Frequ	ıency	7 Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	'armad	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Do	ason	<b>a</b>			Ty	<b>~</b> ~			Majors	
	arnea 	Cum. GPA		expected Grades					ason	.s 				pe 			Majors 	; 
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 24		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 1	.4	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В 13														
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C 1		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 4	1	Non-	-major	41
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0		Ele	ecti <sup>,</sup>	ves				1	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0							_		respons	es to b	e sign	nitican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her				2	14						

? 2

Course-Section: ENGL 226 0101 Title

ENGLISH GRAMMAR USAGE

Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA

Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 27

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 677 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	469/1481	4.59	4.16	4.29	4.40	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	13	12	4.37	693/1481	4.37	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	414/1249	4.59	4.31	4.27	4.36	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	8	5	11	3.89	1101/1424	3.89	4.33	4.21	4.28	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	10	5	11	3.96	744/1396	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.94	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	10	7	6	3.48	1125/1342	3.48	4.34	4.07	4.05	3.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	5	16	4.37	647/1459	4.37	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	17	4.65	959/1480	4.65	4.44	4.68	4.68	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	13	6	4.09	792/1450	4.09	4.15	4.09	4.15	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	659/1409	4.59	4.29	4.42	4.47	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	545/1407	4.89	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	11	11	4.22	855/1399	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	17	4.56	541/1400	4.56	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	17	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	860/1179	3.60	3.87	3.96	4.05	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	5	3	10	4.00	708/1262	4.00	4.28	4.05	4.11	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	3	4	13	4.33	729/1259	4.33	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	3	5	12	4.29	754/1256	4.29	4.56	4.30	4.28	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	6	15	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/ 788	****	3.97	4.00	3.98	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	2	5	3	6	3.65	49/ 55	3.65	3.32	4.55	4.44	3.65
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	1	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	27/ 31	4.13	3.56	4.75	4.50	4.13
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	1	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	42/ 51	4.31	4.31	4.65	4.66	4.31
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	9	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	31/ 34	4.14	4.14	4.83	4.43	4.14
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	11	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****
Post		- <b>-</b>	2 1											

#### Frequency Distribution

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	27	Non-major	18
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 243 0101

Title CURRENTS IN AMERICAN L

Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K

Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 21

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 678 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	9	9	4.29	805/1481	4.29	4.16	4.29	4.40	4.29
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	736/1481	4.33	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.33
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	598/1249	4.43	4.31	4.27	4.36	4.43
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	385/1424	4.55	4.33	4.21	4.28	4.55
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	257/1396	4.57	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.57
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	474/1342	4.33	4.34	4.07	4.05	4.33
	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	505/1459	4.48	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.48
	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	11	9		1126/1480	4.38	4.44	4.68	4.68	4.38
	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	10	4	4.06	808/1450	4.06	4.15	4.09	4.15	4.06
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	891/1409	4.40	4.29	4.42	4.47	4.40
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	728/1407	4.80	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.80
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	636/1399	4.45	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.45
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	10	8	4.25	867/1400	4.25	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.25
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	259/1179	4.50	3.87	3.96	4.05	4.50
٥.	Dia dadiovibual econniques emianee your understanding	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	-	O		1.50	233/11/3	1.50	3.07	3.70	1.05	1.50
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	391/1262	4.45	4.28	4.05	4.11	4.45
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	391/1259	4.73	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.73
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	486/1256	4.64	4.56	4.30	4.28	4.64
	Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	218/ 788		3.97			4.40
	note bpectar techniques saccessiar	10	_	Ü	Ü	_	-	3	1.10	210/ /00	1.10	3.77	1.00	3.70	1.10
	Laboratory														
2	Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	3.00	4.11	4.32	****
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	****	3.50		4.58	****
	Dia the lab imperated provide approxime	20	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	, 210		3.30	1.20	1.50	
	Seminar														
1	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.72	4.49	5.00	****
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.75	4.53	4.83	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.71	4.35	4.72	****
	Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.03	3.92	3.55	****
٥.	more official for grading made official	20	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	, 00		1.05	3.72	3.33	
	Field Work														
1.	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	2.00	4.30	4.67	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	2.00	4.00	4.07	****
	Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.64	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.69	****
	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.80	****
٥.	Did conferences neip you early out field detivities	20	O	U	U	O	O	_	3.00	, 31			1.12	1.00	
	Self Paced														
1		20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.32	4.55	4.44	****
	1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.56	4.75	4.50	****
	2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.31	4.65	4.66	****
	3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.14	4.83	4.43	****
	Were there enough proctors for all the students	20 20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****
٠.			Ü	J	ŭ	Ŭ	ŭ	-	3.00	, 21			1.02	3.00	

Course-Section: ENGL 243 0101

Title CURRENTS IN AMERICAN L

Instructor:

BENSON, LINDA K

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 21

35

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 678 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

#### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		ned Cum. GPA			d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	13	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	В	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 250 0101 University of Maryland INTRO TO SHAKESPEARE Baltimore County Instructor: ORGELFINGER, GA

Title

Enrollment:

32

Spring 2006

Page 679

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaires:	18	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
--	-----------------	----	---------	--------	------------	---------------

							Fre	eque	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1 Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	4.44	626/1481	4.47	4.16	4.29	4.40	4.44
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	-6	11	4.56	458/1481		4.23	4.23	4.29	4.56
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	393/1249		4.31	4.27	4.36	4.61
	_	ations reflect		_	0	0	0	1	1	8	8	4.28	717/1424		4.33	4.21	4.28	4.28
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	126/1396		4.05	3.98	3.94	4.78
				o what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	725/1342		4.34	4.07	4.05	4.06
		g system clearl			0	0	0	1	3	7	7	4.11	899/1459		4.05	4.16	4.17	4.11
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1480		4.44	4.68	4.68	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	,		4.15	4.09	4.15	4.27
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	the instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	500/1409	4.69	4.29	4.42	4.47	4.71
2. Did th	he instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	682/1407	4.84	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.82
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	545/1399	4.55	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.53
4. Did th	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	2	0	15	4.76	299/1400	4.62	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.76
5. Did au	udiovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	2	0	3	0	7	5	3.93	661/1179	4.13	3.87	3.96	4.05	3.93
		Discus																
				what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	305/1262		4.28	4.05	4.11	4.58
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	524/1259		4.53	4.29	4.34	4.58
		_		d open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	357/1256		4.56	4.30	4.28	4.75
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		7	4	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	548/ 788	4.06	3.97	4.00	3.98	3.71
				Frequ	ency	/ Dist	trib	utio	ı									
				1														
Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4						Re	quir	ed f	or M	 ajor	 s	1	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r r	11
28-55							_			-								
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	С 6		Gei	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0													-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0						responses to be significant			ıt					
				I O		Ot1	her				1	.4	-					
? 2																		

Course-Section: ENGL 250 0201 University of Maryla Title INTRO TO SHAKESPEARE Baltimore County Instructor: FARABAUGH, ROBI Spring 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 22

32

University of Maryland Page 680
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

		Frequ			eque	quencies			Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	1	1	6	14	4.50	549/1481	4.47	4.16	4.29	4.40	4.50
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	4	8	10	4.27	801/1481	4.41	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.27
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	1	3	7	11	4.27	726/1249	4.44	4.31	4.27	4.36	4.27
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	3	11	8	4.23	773/1424	4.25	4.33	4.21	4.28	4.23
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	177/1396	4.73	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.68
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	2	1	0	7	12	4.18	603/1342	4.12	4.34	4.07	4.05	4.18
		g system clearl			0	0	0	0	7	6	9	4.09	914/1459	4.10	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.09
		was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	702/1480	4.95	4.44	4.68	4.68	4.91
	-			hing effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	651/1450	4.25	4.15	4.09	4.15	4.24
		Lectur	۵															
1 Were t	he instr	actor's lecture		nrenared	1	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	559/1409	4.69	4.29	4.42	4.47	4.67
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0		18	4.86	614/1407		4.68	4.69	4.78	4.86
				3	1	0	0	0	0		12		491/1399		4.28	4.26	4.29	4.57
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	1	1		13	4.48	624/1400		4.23	4.27	4.34	
				our understanding	1	0	0	1	4			4.33	384/1179		3.87			4.33
		Discus																
1 544					_	0	1	^	0	-	_	1 06	607/1060	4 20	4 00	4 05	4 11	1 00
				what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	7		4.06	687/1262		4.28	4.05	4.11	
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	0		11 12	4.69 4.75	432/1259		4.53	4.29	4.34	4.69
		ctor encourage echniques succe		d open discussion	6 7	0	0	0	1	4 7	7	4.75	357/1256 218/ 788		3.97	4.30	3.98	4.75
4. were s	special to	ecnniques succe	ssiui		/	U	U	U	1	/	/	4.40	218/ /88	4.06	3.97	4.00	3.98	4.40
				Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	<b>;</b>		
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 6								ed f				·	Graduat		0	Majo		14
	8-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 9					Re	quir	eu I	OT M	ajor	S	4	Graduat	е	U	мајс	)T	14
28-55 56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	В 9 С 5		Co	nera	1				3	Under-g	~~d ?	22	Non	-major	8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3 7	D 0		Ge	пета	т				٥	onder-g	rau 2	. 4	MOI1-	-ma Jor	0
84-150 Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	D 0 F 0		. רים	ecti <sup>.</sup>			2 ##		#### - 1	Moona +	horo a	vo not	ono	rh	
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	7	г 0 Р 0		E-T	CCCI	veb				4	respons				_	111
				т О		O+1	her				1	.4	respons	co LU L	e sigi	ııı.cal.	10	
				Ι 0		UT.	ner.				1	. <del>'1</del>						

? 1

Course-Section: ENGL 271 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO CREAT WRTG-FICTI

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 681

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 21 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

SHIVNAN, SALLY

				Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Question		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Genera	 al															
1. Did you gain new insights, ski	ills from	this course	2	0	0	0	3	8	8	4.26	831/1481	4.26	4.16	4.29	4.40	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear			2	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	959/1481		4.23	4.23	4.29	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect	ct the ex	pected goals	2	16	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1249	****	4.31	4.27	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect	the exp	ected goals	2	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	416/1424	4.53	4.33	4.21	4.28	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contrib	oute to w	hat you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	285/1396	4.53	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.53
6. Did written assignments conti	ribute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	257/1342	4.58	4.34	4.07	4.05	4.58
7. Was the grading system clear?	ly explai	ned	2	0	0	2	6	1	10	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class can	celled		2	0	0	0	0	18	1	4.05	1336/1480	4.05	4.44	4.68	4.68	4.05
9. How would you grade the overs	all teach	ing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	10	7	4.33	546/1450	4.33	4.15	4.09	4.15	4.33
Lectu	^_															
1. Were the instructor's lecture		repared	6	0	0	1	2	5	7	4 20	1068/1409	4.20	4.29	4.42	4.47	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem inter	_	-	7	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	614/1407		4.68	4.69	4.78	4.86
3. Was lecture material presente			6	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	683/1399	4.40	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute	6	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	791/1400		4.23	4.27	4.34	4.33		
5. Did audiovisual techniques en	6	14	0	1	0	0	0		****/1179		3.87	3.96	4.05	****		
1	2										,					
Discus	ssion															
1. Did class discussions contrib	oute to w	hat you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	249/1262	4.70	4.28	4.05	4.11	4.70
2. Were all students actively en	ncouraged	to participate	11	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	422/1259	4.70	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage		open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	296/1256		4.56	4.30	4.28	4.80
4. Were special techniques succe	essful		11	1	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	304/ 788	4.22	3.97	4.00	3.98	4.22
		Frequ	iencv	7 Dis	trib	ıt.i.or	n									
		1					-									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99	A 11		Re	guir	ed fo	or M	 ajor	 s	4	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	3	
28-55 0 1.00-1.99	0 0	В 3						J						5		
56-83 3 2.00-2.99	0	C 2		Ge:	nera	1				6	Under-g	rad 2	1	Non-	-major	18
84-150 8 3.00-3.49	4	D 0									J				-	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00	8	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
		P 0	FICCLIVED					respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt				
I 0					her					9						
? 2																

Course-Section: ENGL 273 0101 University of Maryland Title INT CREATIVE WTG-POETR

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 13

Baltimore	County	JUN 13, 2006
Spring	2006	Job IRBR3029

Page 682

	Frequencies
_	

		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	2	1	10	4.62	450/1481	4.62	4.16	4.29	4.40	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	481/1481	4.54	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1046/1249	3.75	4.31	4.27	4.36	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	406/1424	4.54	4.33	4.21	4.28	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	459/1396	4.31	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	303/1342	4.50	4.34	4.07	4.05	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	635/1459	4.38	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1029/1480	4.54	4.44	4.68	4.68	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	259/1450	4.60	4.15	4.09	4.15	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	968/1409	4.33	4.29	4.42	4.47	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1107/1407	4.50	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	567/1399	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	250/1400	4.80	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1179	****	3.87	3.96	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	Λ	Λ	1	1	10	4.75	205/1262	4.75	4.28	4.05	4.11	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	190/1259	4.92	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	357/1256	4.75	4.56	4.30	4.28	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	495/ 788	3.88	3.97	4.00	3.98	3.88
1. Here special techniques successivi	_	-	U		4	_	ر	3.00	193/ 100	3.00	3.91	1.00	3.20	3.00

#### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned Cum. GPA Exp			Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	13	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-	_		
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 291 0101

Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY

Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K

Enrollment:

84-150

Grad.

3

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

2

D

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

1

24 Questionnaires: 19 Spring 2006

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 683 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

					Frequencies				Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	s		NF	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 543		Genera	_	61-2	,			0	0	4	1 2	4 50	407/1401	2 (0	4 1 6	4 00	4 40	4 50
		new insights,ski			(	0		0	2	4	13	4.58	487/1481		4.16	4.29	4.40	4.58
		ctor make clear			(				4	8	7	4.16	917/1481	3.39	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.16
		questions reflec			(			0	1	0	2		****/1249		4.31	4.27	4.36	
		uations reflect			(	) 3 0		0	1 1	4	11	4.63	318/1424	3.79	4.33	4.21	4.28	4.63
				what you learned			, ,	0	1	5	12	4.61	233/1396		4.05	3.98	3.94	4.61
		-		o what you learn			L 0	-	_	2 7	14	4.76	130/1342		4.34	4.07	4.05	4.76
		ng system clearl		inea	2		_	0	4	9	5		1063/1459	3.17	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.88
	_	was class cand			_		, ,	-	•	_	9		1044/1480		4.44	4.68	4.68	4.50
9. How	would you	grade the overa	II teac	hing effectivene	ss 1	. 0	) 0	0	3	8	7	4.22	662/1450	3.53	4.15	4.09	4.15	4.22
		Lectur	е															
1. Were	e the instr	cuctor's lecture	s well	prepared		5 0	0 0	0	3	6	5	4.14	1098/1409	3.39	4.29	4.42	4.47	4.14
		ctor seem inter			4	. 0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	350/1407	4.52	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.93
				xplained clearly	. 4	. 0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	683/1399	3.38	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.40
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						) 0	0	1	7	7	4.40	704/1400		4.23	4.27	4.34	4.40
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandir					l 0 l 12		0	1	0	1		****/1179		3.87	3.96		****
J. Dia	audiovibuo	er ccominques en	nance ,	our unacrotunari	.5			O	_	J	_	3.00	, 11, 5		3.07	3.50	1.05	
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class disc	cussions contrib	ute to	what you learned		5 0	0 (	0	1	3	10	4.64	274/1262	3.95	4.28	4.05	4.11	4.64
2. Were	e all stude	ents actively en	courage	d to participate		5 0	0 (	0	0	2	12	4.86	257/1259	4.20	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.86
3. Did	the instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	d open discussion	n 5	5 0	0 (	0	1	1	12	4.79	320/1256	4.15	4.56	4.30	4.28	4.79
4. Were	e special t	echniques succe	ssful	_	Ē	5 0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	176/ 788	4.31	3.97	4.00	3.98	4.50
		m: -1.4	7.71-															
5 Did	conference	Field		ield activities	18	3 0	) ()	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.80	****
J. DIG	Conterence	s neip you carr	y Out I	Teru accivicies	10	, 0	, 0	U	U		U	1.00	/ 31			1.12	1.00	
		Self	Paced															
1. Did	self-paced	l system contrib	ute to	what you learned	. 18	3 0	0 (	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.32	4.55	4.44	****
3. Were	e your cont	acts with the i	nstruct	or helpful	18	3 0	0 0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.31	4.65	4.66	****
4. Was	3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful				18	3 0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	4.14	4.83	4.43	****
				_														
	Fr							buti	on									
Credits	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							R	eason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 11						 R	egui	red	for M	 Iajor	 s	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	5
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 1 B 5							1									5		-
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		C	ener	al				3	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	major	14
04 15		2.00 2.00	_	<u> </u>		_						-	011001 9		-	1.011		

Electives

Other

1

11

Course-Section: ENGL 291 0201

Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY

Instructor: MABE, MITZI J

Enrollment: 22

Questionnaires: 17

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 684 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	1					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	_	_	2	0 04	1460/1401	2 60	4 16	4 00	4 40	0 04
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	0	6	3	3		1462/1481			4.29	4.40	2.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	0	9	Ţ	1		1471/1481	3.39	4.23	4.23	4.29	2.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	2	1		****/1249	****	4.31	4.27	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	5	1	3	5	1		1402/1424	3.79	4.33	4.21	4.28	2.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	7	1	5	3	1		1375/1396	3.30	4.05	3.98	3.94	2.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	0	1	4	8		1018/1342	4.23	4.34	4.07	4.05	3.71
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	0	1	8	2	4	1	1		1437/1459	3.17	4.05	4.16	4.17	2.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	11		966/1480		4.44	4.68	4.68	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	4	1	6	4	0	2.67	1417/1450	3.53	4.15	4.09	4.15	2.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	5	4	1	1	2	2.31	1402/1409	3.39	4.29	4.42	4.47	2.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	0	1	11		1019/1407	4.52	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	4	3	3	2	1		1384/1399	3.38	4.28	4.26	4.29	2.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	1	3	3	1		1361/1400		4.23	4.27	4.34	2.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	10	0	0	2	1	0		****/1179			3.96	4.05	****
1,									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	0	1	5	4	3.54	983/1262	3.95	4.28	4.05	4.11	3.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	3	1	1	8	4.08	875/1259	4.20	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	901/1256	4.15	4.56	4.30	4.28	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	358/ 788	4.31	3.97	4.00	3.98	4.13
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 55	****	3.32	4.55	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31	****	3.56	4.75	4.50	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.31	4.65	4.66	****

Credits Ea	Credits Earned			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	5	Under-grad	17	Non-major	11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	_			
				2	2						

Course-Section: ENGL 291 0301 University of Maryland Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Enrollment: 25

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 9

MCGURRIN JR, AN

Page 685 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 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	5	2	1	3.33	1407/1481	3.62	4.16	4.29	4.40	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1303/1481	3.39	4.23	4.23	4.29	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1249	****	4.31	4.27	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	959/1424	3.79	4.33	4.21	4.28	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	2	0	2.88	1331/1396	3.30	4.05	3.98	3.94	2.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	565/1342	4.23	4.34	4.07	4.05	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1236/1459	3.17	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	2	2	4	0	3.00	1469/1480	4.05	4.44	4.68	4.68	3.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1133/1450	3.53	4.15	4.09	4.15	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1261/1409	3.39	4.29	4.42	4.47	3.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1296/1407	4.52	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	1	1	3.29	1288/1399	3.38	4.28	4.26	4.29	3.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	1	2	1	3.00	1312/1400	3.31	4.23	4.27	4.34	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1179	****	3.87	3.96	4.05	****
_, ,														
Discussion	_		_	_			_				4 00			
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	0	Τ	3.67	931/1262		4.28	4.05	4.11	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	0	1		1067/1259	4.20	4.53	4.29	4.34	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	0	1		1069/1256	4.15	4.56	4.30	4.28	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	4.31	3.97	4.00	3.98	***
Frequ														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	6	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 301 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG

JUN 13, 2006 Instructor: FARABAUGH, ROBI Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 686

Enrollment:	21		-
Questionnaires:	15	Student Course	Evaluation Questionnaire

						Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	nı gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	2	1	5	7	4.13	976/1481	4.32	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.13
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	481/1481	4.50	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.53
		uestions reflec			2	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	548/1249	4.49	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.46
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	645/1424	4.51	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.33
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	330/1396	4.62	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.47
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	405/1342	4.42	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.40
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	6	2	6	3.87	1078/1459	4.17	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.87
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	12	3	4.20	1260/1480	4.71	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.20
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	692/1450	4.27	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.20
1 Ware +	ho inata	n.c.no.wo.d	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	727/1409	4.57	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.54		
	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	1	12	4.54	400/1409	4.57	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.54
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	1	0	3	9	4.54	534/1399	4.57	4.08	4.09	4.07	4.54
		es contribute t			2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	385/1400	4.57	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.69
				our understanding	3	5	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	870/1179	3.63	3.87	3.96	4.02	3.57
5. Did au	laiovisua.	i teciniques en	nance y	our understanding	3	5	1	U	4	۷	۷	3.57	8/0/11/9	3.03	3.07	3.90	4.02	3.57
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	507/1262	4.39	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.33
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	3	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	588/1259	4.64	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.50
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	571/1256	4.57	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.50
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		3	2	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	176/ 788	3.99	3.97	4.00	4.07	4.50
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	'armad	Cum. GPA		Errogted Credes				Do	200	<b>a</b>			TT+ ==				Madama	
	arned	Expected Grades					ason	s 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	; 		
00-27							quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 9														
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C 2		Ge	nera:	l				1	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
I O						Ot1	her				1	2						

Course-Section: ENGL 301 0201 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG

I

?

0

0

Instructor: SMITH, ORIANNE Spring 2006

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 687

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

					-				Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
		 Genera	.1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	587/1481	4.32	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.4
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	434/1481	4.50	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.5
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	1	0	7	10	4.44	573/1249	4.49	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.4
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	310/1424	4.51	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.6
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	177/1396	4.62	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.6
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	7	10	4.32	494/1342	4.42	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.3
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	4	3	11	4.26	766/1459	4.17	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.2
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1480	4.71	4.44	4.68	4.65	5.0
9. How wo	. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiven							0	0	11	5	4.31	567/1450	4.27	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.3
		Lectur																
1. Were t	he instru	prepared	3	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	852/1409	4.57	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.4		
2. Did th	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	3	13	4.81	705/1407	4.91	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.8
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	567/1399	4.57	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.5
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	3	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	591/1400	4.59	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.5
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques er	hance y	our understanding	3	6	2	1	2	3	2	3.20	1011/1179	3.63	3.87	3.96	4.02	3.2
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	228/1262	4.39	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.7
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	229/1259	4.64	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.8
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	272/1256	4.57	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.8
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		1	4	0	1	3	7	3	3.86	501/ 788	3.99	3.97	4.00	4.07	3.8
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Туј	oe .			Majors	3		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	11
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В 9														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General							2	Under-g	rad 1	L9	Non-	-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0									respons	es to k	oe sign	ificar	ıt	
				_							_	_						

Other

16

Course-Section: ENGL 301 0301 University of Maryland ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG Baltimore County

Title Instructor: GWIAZDA, PIOTR Spring 2006

Enrollment:	22		
Questionnaires:	18	Student Course	Evaluation Questionnaire

					Frequencies I						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 y	you gain n	ew insights,skills	from this course	1	0	1	0	1	5	10	4.35	729/1481	4.32	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.35
2. Did t	the instru	ctor make clear the	expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	12	4.39	682/1481	4.50	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.39
3. Did t	the exam q	uestions reflect th	e expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	432/1249	4.49	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.57
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect the	expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	14	4.56	385/1424	4.51	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.56
5. Did a	assigned r	eadings contribute	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	151/1396	4.62	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.72
6. Did w	written as	signments contribut	e to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	270/1342	4.42	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.56
7. Was t	the gradin	g system clearly ex	plained	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	635/1459	4.17	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.39
8. How n	many times	was class cancelle	d	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	421/1480	4.71	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.94
9. How w	would you	grade the overall t	eaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	588/1450	4.27	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.29
		Lecture															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lectures we	11 prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	466/1409	4.57	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.72
		ctor seem intereste		0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1407	4.91	4.68	4.69	4.67	5.00
			d explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	376/1399	4.57	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.67
		es contribute to wh	_	1	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	511/1400	4.59	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.59
			e your understanding	0	2	0	0	5	4	7	4.13	541/1179	3.63	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.13
		Discussion															
1. Did o	class disc		to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	659/1262	4.39	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.13
			aged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	572/1259	4.64	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.53
		_	and open discussion	2	0	1	1	0	3	11	4.38	698/1256	4.57	4.56	4.30	4.34	
		echniques successfu	_	1	1	1	1	4	7	3	3.63	577/ 788		3.97	4.00		3.63
			Frequ	iency	, Dis	trib	utio	n									
a 1''		a ana	_	-								_					
Credits	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Rea	ason	S 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	; . – – – –
00-27 28-55	0 5	0.00-0.99 0 1.00-1.99 0	А 7 В 9		Required for Majors 0						0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	11

Page 688

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 303 0101 University of Maryland Title ART OF THE ESSAY Instructor: Fitzgerald, Wil

Enrollment:

22

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 689 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	14	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	1	0	2	2	0	4.21	896/1481	4.21	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	-	•	1	1	3	1	0		1000/1481	4.21	4.10	4.23	4.23	4.21
<u> </u>	0	0 10	0	0	0	0	4	4.00 5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.23	4.23	4.23	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	1	-	-	0	4		,					
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	Ţ	Ţ	0	3	2	7	4.08	923/1424	4.08	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	Ι	0	5	8	4.43	363/1396	4.43	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	384/1342	4.43	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	5	1	2	1	2	2		1337/1459	3.25	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	7	3	3		1450/1480	3.57	4.44	4.68	4.65	3.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	786/1450	4.09	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.09
<u>.</u> .														
Lecture	0	0	0	_	_	_	_	4 22	060/1400	4 22	4 00	4 40	4 40	4 22
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	2	-7	4.33	968/1409	4.33	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	659/1407	4.83	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	0	2	8	4.33	753/1399	4.33	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	867/1400	4.25	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1179	****	3.87	3.96	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	345/1262	4.50	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	422/1259	4.70	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	428/1256	4.70	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	526/ 788	3.78	3.97	4.00	4.07	3.78
1. Were special techniques successivi	-	_		U	5		-	3.70	320/ 700	3.70	3.71	1.00	1.07	3.70
Frequ	ency.	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туу	oe			Majors	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	14	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Į.
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-			
				2	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 304 0101

Title BRIT LIT:MEDIEVAL/RENA

Instructor: FALCO, RAPHAEL

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 14

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 690 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			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	1	0	0	Ο	0	1	12	4.92	127/1481	4.92	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	- 8	4.62	386/1481	4.62	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	548/1249	4.46	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	437/1424		4.33	4.21	4.27	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	65/1396		4.05	3.98	4.00	4.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	,		4.34	4.07	4.12	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	224/1459	4.71	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	1100/1480	4.43	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	135/1450	4.82	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	588/1409	4.64	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	491/1399	4.57	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	208/1400	4.85	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1179	****	3.87	3.96	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	381/1262	4.46	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	751/1259	4.31	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	785/1256	4.23	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.23
4. Were special techniques successful	1	11	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 788	****	3.97	4.00	4.07	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	3.00	4.11	4.23	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	3.00	4.40	4.36	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.75	4.53	4.66	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 63	****	4.33	4.44	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.71	4.35	4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	4.03	3.92	4.43	****

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	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 305 0101 University of Maryland BRIT LIT:RESTOR - ROMA Baltimore County

Title Instructor: SMITH, ORIANNE Spring 2006

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 30

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 691

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	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	1	0	0	1	1	8	19	4.55	505/1481	4.55	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	20	4.62	374/1481	4.62	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	20	4.59	423/1249	4.59	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	6	18	4.41	545/1424	4.41	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	3	22	4.68	185/1396	4.68	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	9	16	4.46	343/1342	4.46	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	10	18	4.59	367/1459	4.59	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	281/1480	4.97	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	1	0	2	7	13	4.35	536/1450	4.35	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	275/1409	4.85	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	200/1407	4.96	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	8	18	4.69	335/1399	4.69	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	250/1400	4.81	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	3	1	4	1	6	3.40	945/1179	3.40	3.87	3.96	4.02	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	244/1262	4.71	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	1	21	4.79	314/1259	4.79	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	2	20	4.75	357/1256	4.75	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	0	1	5	4	7	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	3.97	4.00	4.07	4.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	2	В	18						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	7	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	30	Non-major	9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	26	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 306 0101 University of Maryland Title

BRIT LIT: VICTORIAN-MO Baltimore County Fernandez, Jean Spring 2006

Instructor: Enrollment: 31

Questionnaires: 22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 692 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	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	1	0	1	1	0	4	15	4.48	587/1481	4.48	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	2	5	12	4.35	715/1481	4.35	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	1	1	14	4.65	357/1249	4.65	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	416/1424	4.52	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	241/1396	4.60	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	303/1342	4.50	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	671/1459	4.35	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	11	8	4.35	1146/1480	4.35	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	417/1450	4.44	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1409	****	4.29	4.42	4.43	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1407	****	4.68	4.69	4.67	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1399	****	4.28	4.26	4.27	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1400	****	4.23	4.27	4.28	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	1	1	13	4.28	556/1262	4.28	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.28
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	336/1259	4.78	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	394/1256	4.72	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.72
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	4	2	2	1	3	2.75	742/ 788	2.75	3.97	4.00	4.07	2.75
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ution	า									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	17	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	6
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ENGL 307 0101 University of Maryland Page 693 Title Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 AM LIT TO CIVIL WAR Instructor: HOLTON, ADALAIN Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 37

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questionnaires: 24

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	5	17	4.54	513/1481	4.54	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	17	4.54	469/1481	4.54	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	196/1249	4.82	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	16	4.54	395/1424	4.54	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	2	18	4.64	217/1396	4.64	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	4	17	4.64	214/1342	4.64	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.44	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	334/1450	4.50	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	350/1409	4.79	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	659/1407	4.83	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	17	4.71	322/1399	4.71	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	5	18	4.63	468/1400	4.63	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	2	2	6	11	3.96	641/1179	3.96	3.87	3.96	4.02	3.96
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	3	17	4.48	372/1262	4.48	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.48
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	285/1259	4.83	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	1	20	4.74	382/1256	4.74	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.74
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	4	7	12	4.35	249/ 788	4.35	3.97	4.00	4.07	4.35
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	15						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	24	Non-major	6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	19				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ENGL 308 0101 University of Maryland Title AM LIT AFTER CIVIL WAR Baltimore County

AM LIT AFTER CIVIL WAR Baltimore County GWIAZDA, PIOTR Spring 2006

Enrollment: 35

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 27

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 694 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			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	6	21	4.78	268/1481	4.78	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	324/1481	4.67	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	23	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1249	****	4.31	4.27	4.28	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	6	18	4.58	364/1424	4.58	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	87/1396	4.89	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	190/1342	4.67	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	8	15	4.46	520/1459	4.46	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	770/1480	4.85	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	1	10	11	4.21	683/1450	4.21	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	Λ	Λ	3	23	4.88	217/1409	4.88	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	400/1407	4.92	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	212/1399	4.81	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	20	4.65	433/1400	4.65	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	2	1	5	16	4.46	299/1179	4.46	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.46
Discussion	_		0	•	_		0.0	4 00	154/1060	4 00	4 00	4 05	4 1 4	4 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	4	20	4.83	154/1262	4.83	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	-	0	0	2	2	19	4.63	489/1259 240/1256	4.63	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	3	0 6	3	2	0 2	3 4	21 7	4.88	594/ 788	4.88	4.56 3.97	4.30	4.34	4.88 3.56
1. Note special deciminates successful	3	J	3	-	_	-	,	3.30	3317 700	3.30	3.57	1.00	1.07	3.30
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 18 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 6		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	`s	1	Graduate	 e	0	Majo	r	23

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0		18	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	С	2	General	1	Under-grad	27	Non-major	4
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	24	_			
				2	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Page 695

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor:	GLADSTONE,	JASO	Spring 2006
Enrollment:	23		
Questionnaires:	11		Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

TOPICS IN FICTION

Course-Section: ENGL 312 0101

Title

							Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	1	0	1	6	3	3.91	1162/1481	3.91	4.16	4.29	4.29	3.91
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.00
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	405/1249	4.60	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.60
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	334/1424	4.60	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.60
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	111/1396	4.80	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.80
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	238/1342	4.60	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.60
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	1	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.50
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	1139/1480	4.36	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.36
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	.ll teac	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	692/1450	4.20	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.20
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	483/1409	4.71	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.71
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	3	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	1200/1407	4.38	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.38
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	3	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	828/1399	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.25
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	3	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	521/1400	4.57	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.57
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1179	****	3.87	3.96	4.02	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	236/1262	4.71	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.71
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.53	4.29	4.34	5.00
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.56	4.30	4.34	5.00
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		4	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.97	4.00	4.07	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	1	 0.00-0.99							or Ma			1	 Graduat		0	Majo		
28-55	1 2	1.00-1.99	0	A 5 B 3		кес	4urr	eu L	OT Mg	JOES	>	Т	Graduat	E	U	Ma JC	)T	5
28-55 56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	В 3 С 1		Cos	nera	1				5	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Mos	-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0		Gei	ier a	т				5	onder-9	ıau 1	. 1	MOI1-	·iiia JUL	O
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	Б 0 F 0		<b>៤</b> 12	ecti <sup>.</sup>	700				0	#### - :	Meane +	hara a	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	ی	P 0		11.1		vca				U	respons				_	1++
				I 0		O+1	ner					2	T CPPOILE		c bigi	ıııcaı		
				1 0			151					4						

Course-Section: ENGL 316 0101

Title LITERATURE & OTHER ART

Instructor: NEWMAN-SAUL, EL

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 14

MAN-SAUL, EL Spring 2006

Page 696 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Cou	rse	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Ме	an	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1																
1. Did vo	nı gain n	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	2	2	3	1	6	3.50	1358/14	31 3.	50	4.16	4.29	4.29	3.50
		ctor make clear			0	0	2	3	5	2	2		1438/14				4.23	4.23	2.93
		uestions reflec			0	1	1	2	3	3	_		1111/12			4.31		4.28	3.54
		uations reflect			0	0	3	1	1	6	3		1311/14			4.33	4.21	4.27	3.36
				what you learned	0	1	3	3	3	3			1350/13			4.05	3.98	4.00	2.69
	_	_		to what you learned	0	0	1	2	6	2	3		1200/13			4.34	4.07	4.12	3.29
		g system clearl			0	0	3	4	3	1	-		1413/14			4.05	4.16	4.17	2.79
		was class canc		ainea	0	0	0	0	0	13							4.16		4.07
	-					-	-	0	-				1331/14			4.44		4.65	
HOW WO	ula you	grade the overa	II tead	ching effectiveness	4	0	2	0	4	3	Τ	3.10	1343/14	50 3.	ΤÜ	4.15	4.09	4.10	3.10
		Lectur	е																
l. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	2	4	3	3	3.58	1283/14	09 3.	58	4.29	4.42	4.43	3.58
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	963/14	07 4.	67	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.67
				explained clearly	3	0	2	0	4	1	4		1248/13				4.26	4.27	3.45
		es contribute t			2	0	1	3	2	2			1253/14				4.27		
				your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92						4.02	
o. Did au	laiovisua	i teciniques en	nance y	your understanding	1	U	U	U	U	_	12	4.92	70/11	19 4.	92	3.07	3.90	4.02	4.92
		Discus																	
l. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	2	3	3.36	1052/12	52 3.	36	4.28	4.05	4.14	3.36
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	0	0	1	0	4	2	7	4.00	895/12	59 4.	00	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.00
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	0	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	872/12	56 4.	07	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.07
4. Were s	pecial t	echniques succe	ssful		0	1	3	2	5	2	1	2.69	746/ 7	38 2.	69	3.97	4.00	4.07	2.69
		Labora	torv																
2. Were y	ou provi			ground information	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 2	19 **	* *	3.00	4.11	4.23	****
1 5:3 6:		Field		what you learned	1 2	^	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	++++/	-0 ++	4 4	2 00	4 20	4 40	++++
					13	0	1 1	0	-	-			,	59 **		2.00	4.30	4.48	****
2. Dia yo	u cleari	y understand yo	ur eval	luation criteria	13	0	Т	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	51 **	* *	2.00	4.00	4.13	****
		Self																	
1. Did se	lf-paced	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	55 **	* *	3.32	4.55	4.88	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n										
Credits E	arnod	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				P.O.	asons	~				Гуре				Majors	
																			, . – – – –
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Gradu	ate		0	Majo	or	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6															
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 1		Ger	nera	1				8	Under	-grad	1	4	Non-	-major	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D 0															
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	####	- Mean	s ti	here a	re not	enous	ıh
				P 0												e sign		_	
				I O		O+1	ner					5							
				5 0		0.01						_							
				; U															

Course-Section: ENGL 324 0101 University of Maryland Title THEORIES OF COMM TECH

SHIPKA, JODY

Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 697

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 19 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Quagtions					Fre	_	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1 Did vo	nı gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	1	1	2	3	12	4.26	831/1481	4.26	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.26
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	3	0	2	6	- 8		1154/1481		4.23	4.23	4.23	3.84
		estions reflec			0	12	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	598/1249		4.31	4.27	4.28	4.43
	_	ations reflect		_	0	2	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	896/1424		4.33	4.21	4.27	4.12
				what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	11	4.32			4.05	3.98	4.00	4.32
				o what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	6	7		927/1342		4.34	4.07	4.12	3.84
		g system clearl			0	1	2	4	6	1	5		1356/1459		4.05	4.16	4.17	3.17
		was class canc			1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	951/1480		4.44	4.68	4.65	4.67
	-			hing effectiveness	2	0	2	2	1	3	9		989/1450		4.15	4.09	4.10	3.88
		,		3														
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	the instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	3	0	0	2	1	7	6	4.06	1134/1409	4.06	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.06
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	919/1407	4.71	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.71
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	956/1399	4.12	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.12
4. Did th	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned			you learned	2	0	2	0	3	5	7	3.88	1095/1400	3.88	4.23	4.27	4.28	3.88
5. Did au	udiovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	8	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	197/1179	4.63	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.63
		-	_	_														
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	315/1262	4.56	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.56
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	3	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	432/1259	4.69	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.69
3. Did th	ne instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	288/1256	4.81	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.81
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		3	1	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	459/ 788	3.93	3.97	4.00	4.07	3.93
				Frequ	.ency	7 Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	guire	ed fo	or Ma	ior	 s	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 10						J						5		-
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Gei	nera:	L				1	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0									5				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enou	<sub>j</sub> h
				P 0									respons				_	-
				I 0		Ot1	her				1	.5	-		3			
				? 1														

Course-Section: ENGL 326 0101 University of Maryland Title STRUCTURE OF ENGLISH Baltimore County Instructor: Fitzgerald, Wil Spring 2006

University of Maryland Page 698
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	28				
Questionnaires:	18	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	8	9	4.39	698/1481	4.39	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	801/1481	4.28	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	381/1249	4.63	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	671/1424	4.31	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	151/1396	4.72	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	3	9	4.17	626/1342	4.17	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	7	6	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	3	2	10	3	3.72	1442/1480	3.72	4.44	4.68	4.65	3.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	1098/1409	4.14	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	766/1407	4.79	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	929/1399	4.14	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	1	2	9	4.14	953/1400	4.14	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	320/1262	4.56	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	548/1259	4.56	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	723/1256	4.33	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.97	4.00	4.07	***
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ution	ı									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	С	1	General	2	Under-grad	18	Non-major	7
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 348 0101 University of Maryland Title LITERATURE AND CULTURE Baltimore County

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor: SMITH, ORIANNE

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 14

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

Page 699 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

					Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,skil	ls from	this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	487/1481	4.57	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.57
2. Did the	e instruc	tor make clear	the expe	cted goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	386/1481	4.62	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.62
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the exp	ected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	178/1249	4.85	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.85
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the expe	cted goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	263/1424	4.69	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.69
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contribu	ite to wha	at you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	131/1396	4.77	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.77
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contri	bute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	230/1342	4.62	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.62
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	explain	ed	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	189/1459	4.77	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.77
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1126/1480	4.38	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.38
9. How wou	uld you g	grade the overal	l teachi	ng effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	217/1450	4.67	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.67
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures	well pro	epared	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.29	4.42	4.43	5.00
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem intere	ested in	the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.67	5.00
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presented	and exp	lained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.27	5.00
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute to	what you	ı learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.28	5.00
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enh	nance you	r understanding	2	2	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	259/1179	4.50	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.50
		Discuss																
		ıssions contribu			1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	249/1262	4.69	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.69
		its actively end			1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	169/1259	4.92	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.92
		tor encourage f		open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	173/1256		4.56	4.30	4.34	4.92
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	sful		1	1	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	254/ 788	4.33	3.97	4.00	4.07	4.33
		Seminar																
	_	opics relevant			13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.72	4.49	4.70	***
				idual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 69		4.75	4.53	4.66	****
	_	ojects contribu		-	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.33	4.44	4.56	****
_		ons contribute t	_	ou learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.71	4.35	4.48	****
5. Were cr	riteria f	or grading made	e clear		13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	***	4.03	3.92	4.43	***
				Freq	uency	/ Dist	rib	utior	ı									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
00 27	0	0 00 0 00	0									1						1.0
00-27 28-55	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4 B 6		кес	1uir	ed fo	or. MS	ijor	S	Τ	Graduat	e	0	Majo	ŊŢ	10
	J.	1.00-1.99	1	В 6 С 2		0		1				1	IIndor -	mad 1	1	Mon	ma i a	1
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	D 0		Ger	nera:	Т				4	Under-g	rau l	.4	NON-	-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	ט ע														

Electives

Other

0

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 351 0101

Title STUDIES IN SHAKESPEARE

Instructor: ORLIN, LENA

Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 22

Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 700 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

	Questions			NR	NA	Fro	eque: 2	ncies 3	s 4	5		tructor Rank		e Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 544		General	f +bi	0	^	0	1	0	5	1.0	1 (1	400/1401	1 (1	4.16	4 20	4 20	1 (1
		ew insights,skills ctor make clear the		0	0	0	1 1	1	5 5	16 15	4.64	428/1481 469/1481		4.16	4.29	4.29	4.64 4.55
		lestions reflect th		0	4	0	1	0	4	13	4.55				4.23	4.23	4.55
	_	ations reflect the		0	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	395/1249		4.33	4.21	4.27	4.55
			to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	151/1396		4.05	3.98	4.00	4.73
	_	9	te to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	8	9	4.18	603/1342		4.34	4.07	4.12	
		g system clearly ex	_	0	0	0	0	2	6		4.55	413/1459		4.05	4.16	4.17	4.55
		was class cancelle		0	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	974/1480		4.44	4.68	4.65	4.64
	-		teaching effectiveness	3	3	0	0	2	3	11						4.10	4.56
		Lecture															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lectures we	ell prepared	5	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	739/1409	4.53	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.53
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem intereste	ed in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	545/1407	4.88	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.88
3. Was led	cture mat	terial presented an	nd explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	480/1399	4.59	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.59
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to wh	nat you learned	5	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	692/1400	4.41	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.41
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques enhand	ce your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	92/1179	4.88	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.88
		Discussion	ı														
			to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	418/1262		4.28	4.05	4.14	4.43
			raged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	2	18	4.76	347/1259		4.53	4.29	4.34	4.76
		_	and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	256/1256		4.56	4.30	4.34	4.86
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques successfu	ıl	1	1	2	2	7	5	4	3.35	665/ 788	3.35	3.97	4.00	4.07	3.35
		Seminar						_									
			individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 69		4.75	4.53	4.66	****
	_	_	to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 63		4.33	4.44	4.56	****
4. Dia pre	esentatio	ons contribute to v	what you learned	21	0	0	U	U	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.71	4.35	4.48	* * * *
		Field Worl	ς														
1. Did fie	eld exper	rience contribute t	to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	2.00	4.30	4.48	****
			evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	2.00	4.00	4.13	***
3. Was the	e instruc	ctor available for	consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****
		Self Pace															
	_	-	to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 55		3.32	4.55	4.88	****
3. Were yo	our conta	acts with the inst	ructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.31	4.65	4.88	***
			Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 7		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	 ijor	`	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	18
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	в 12														
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	C 1		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 2	22	Non-	-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 8	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	ıh
			Р 0									respons	es to b	oe sigr	nificar	ıt	
			I 0		Otl	her				1	9						
			3 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 369 0101 University of Maryland Title RACE RELATIONS/AMER LI

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 701

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:

HOLTON, ADALAIN

Instructor:

Questionnaires:	25	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	5	4	16	4.44	626/1481	4.44	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.44
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	17	4.68	311/1481	4.68	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.68
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	19	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1249	****	4.31	4.27	4.28	****
4. Did ot	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	17	4.68	279/1424	4.68	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.68
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	156/1396	4.72	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.72
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	5	18	4.67	190/1342	4.67	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.67
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	3	6	15	4.40	611/1459	4.40	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.40
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.44	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	1	0	3	6	12	4.27	609/1450	4.27	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.27
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	217/1409	4.88	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.88
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.67	5.00
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	178/1399	4.84	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.84
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	250/1400	4.80	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.80
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	1	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	115/1179	4.79	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.79
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc			what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	162/1262	4.82	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.82
				d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	248/1259	4.86	4.53	4.29		4.86
				d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	216/1256	4.91	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.91
		echniques succe			3	7	2	1	2	4	6	3.73	540/ 788		3.97			3.73
				Frequ	enct	, Die	tri bi	ıtior	า									
				11040	cricy	DIS	CIID	20101	1									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Re	guir	ed fo	or Ma	ior		6	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	16
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 16		110	7			- ,	_	-	2_34440	-	-	- 100 ) 0	-	0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Ger	nera	1			1	.3	Under-g	rad 2	:5	Non-	major	9
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	7	D 0									5				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	уh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I O		Ot1	her					6	_		_			
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 371 0101 University of Maryland Page 702 Title CREATIVE WRITING-FICTI Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006

Instructor: Oliver, Laura

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 12

# Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.50
_	-	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	228/1481	4.75	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.75
		uestions reflec		-	0	8	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	245/1249	4.75	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.75
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	1	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	497/1424	4.45	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.45
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	338/1396	4.45	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.45
				to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	251/1342	4.58	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.58
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	5	2	5	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1107/1480	4.42	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.42
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	196/1450	4.70	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.70
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	_	prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	826/1409	4.45	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.45
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	705/1407		4.68	4.69	4.67	4.82
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	523/1399		4.28	4.26	4.27	4.55
		es contribute t			3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	287/1400	4.78	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.78
				our understanding	1	8	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1041/1179	3.00	3.87	3.96	4.02	3.00
		Discus	gion															
1. Did cl	lass disci			what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	320/1262	4.56	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.56
				ed to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	229/1259		4.53	4.29	4.34	4.89
				nd open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	332/1256		4.56	4.30	4.34	4.78
		echniques succe			3	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	394/ 788		3.97		4.07	4.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	-rih	ıtioı	า									
				11040	cricy	DID		20101	-									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	 5	0	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 5			_			-						_		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				6	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - I				_	rh
				P U									reshous	co LU L	e sigi	ııııdı		

Other

0

1

I ? Course-Section: ENGL 373 0101 University of Maryland CREATIVE WRITING-POETR

Title Baltimore County Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN Spring 2006

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 703

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

							Fr	equer	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	.1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	0	1	5	0	1	3.14	1435/1481	3.14	4.16	4.29	4.29	3.14
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	2	3	2	0	3.00	1420/1481	3.00	4.23	4.23	4.23	3.00
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the	expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1118/1249	3.50	4.31	4.27	4.28	3.50
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1424	****	4.33	4.21	4.27	****
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	2	1	0	4	0	0	2.60	1358/1396	2.60	4.05	3.98	4.00	2.60
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute	to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.00
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expl	ained	0	1	2	2	2	0	0	2.00	1438/1459	2.00	4.05	4.16	4.17	2.00
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1295/1480	4.14	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.14
9. How wo	ow would you grade the overall teaching effective				0	1	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1223/1450	3.50	4.15	4.09	4.10	3.50
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	-	prepared	4	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1391/1409	2.67	4.29	4.42	4.43	2.67
		ctor seem inter			4	0	0	0	1	0			1221/1407			4.69		4.33
				explained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	0			1371/1399			4.26	4.27	
		es contribute t			4	0	0	0	3	0			1312/1400		4.23	4.27	4.28	3.00
				your understanding	4	2	0	0	1	0			****/1179			3.96	4.02	****
		Discus	ed on															
1 Did cl	lace diec			what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	0	1	3 17	1108/1262	3.17	4.28	4.05	4 14	3.17
				ed to participate	1		0	0		1			836/1259			4.29	4.34	
		-	_	nd open discussion	1	-	0	0	2	0		4.33	,					
				Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utior	ı									
				-	-													
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	5 5	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3														
								_					_	_	_			

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

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Course-Section: ENGL 382 0101

24

FEATURE WRITING

CORBETT, CHRIS

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Page 704 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

C+1	~	The second second second	0	
Student	course	Evaluation	Ouestionn	aire

							Fr	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did y	you gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	188/1481	4.87	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.87
2. Did t	the instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	324/1481	4.67	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.67
3. Did t	the exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	4	7	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	334/1249	4.67	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.67
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	2	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	287/1424	4.67	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.67
5. Did a	assigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	136/1396	4.75	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.75
6. Did v	written as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	60/1342	4.94	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.94
7. Was t	the grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	2	1	4	9	4.25	775/1459	4.25	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.25
8. How m	many times	was class canc	elled		2	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1029/1480	4.53	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.53
9. How v	would you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	252/1450	4.62	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.62
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	290/1409	4.83	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.83
2. Did t	the instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	450/1407	4.92	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.92
3. Was ]	lecture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	116/1399	4.92	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.92
4. Did t	the lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	131/1400	4.92	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.92
5. Did a	audiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	5	8	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1179	****	3.87	3.96	4.02	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did o	class disc			what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	228/1262	4.73	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.73
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	9		294/1259	4.82	4.53	4.29		4.82
				d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	288/1256	4.82	4.56	4.30		4.82
		echniques succe			6	5	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	335/ 788	4.17	3.97			4.17
				Frequ	ienas	nia.	trib	1+101	2									
				riequ	lency	DIS	CIID	10101	.1									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r )r	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 7			-			-						3 -		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Ge	nera	1				4	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	major	12
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D 0									J				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		El	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I O		Ot]	her				1	.0	_		_			
				? 0														

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Page 705 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

uestionnaires:	16	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 383 0101

22

SCIENCE WRITING

Fitzgerald, Wil

Title

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

6

Ρ

I

?

0

0

Instructor:

Enrollment:

							Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	1	0	2	1	4	6	2	3.33	1407/1481	3.33	4.16	4.29	4.29	3.33
2. Did th	he instruc	tor make clear	the ex	spected goals	1	0	0	1	7	5	2	3.53	1309/1481	3.53	4.23	4.23	4.23	3.53
3. Did th	he exam qu	estions reflect	t the e	expected goals	1	12	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1249	****	4.31	4.27	4.28	****
4. Did of	ther evalu	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	1	0	0	2	5	5	3	3.60	1242/1424	3.60	4.33	4.21	4.27	3.60
5. Did as	ssigned re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	2	1	6	3	3	3.27	1195/1396	3.27	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.27
6. Did w	ritten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	3	5	3.60	1071/1342	3.60	4.34	4.07	4.12	3.60
		system clearly		ained	1	0	0	1	5	3	6	3.93	1021/1459	3.93	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.93
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	2	7	5	1	3.33	1462/1480	3.33	4.44	4.68	4.65	3.33
9. How wo	ould you g	rade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	6	6	1	3.50	1223/1450	3.50	4.15	4.09	4.10	3.50
		Lecture	е															
1. Were t	the instru	ctor's lectures	s well	prepared	2	0	0	1	7	4	2	3.50	1293/1409	3.50	4.29	4.42	4.43	3.50
2. Did th	he instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	1211/1407	4.36	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.36
3. Was le	ecture mat	erial presented	d and e	explained clearly	2	0	0	1	8	2	3	3.50	1237/1399	3.50	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.50
4. Did th	he lecture	s contribute to	o what	you learned	2	0	1	3	2	5	3	3.43	1250/1400	3.43	4.23	4.27	4.28	3.43
5. Did a	udiovisual	techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	2	9	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	760/1179	3.80	3.87	3.96	4.02	3.80
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass discu			what you learned	8	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	949/1262	3.63	4.28	4.05	4.14	3.63
				ed to participate	8	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	992/1259	3.88	4.53	4.29	4.34	3.88
		-	_	nd open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	773/1256		4.56	4.30	4.34	4.25
4. Were s	special te	chniques succes	ssful	-	8	5	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 788	****	3.97	4.00	4.07	****
				Frequ	iency	, Dist	trib	utior	ı									
				-	_													
Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo		5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 7			_			-								
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ger	nera:	l				6	Under-g	rad 1	6	Non-	major	11
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D 0														

Electives

Other

1

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 387 0101 University of Maryland Title WEB CONTENT DEVELOPMEN Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor: KOMLODI, ANITA

Enrollment: 6

Questionnaires: 3

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 706

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	395/1481	4.67	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1481	4.67	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	334/1249	4.67	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.33	4.21	4.27	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	193/1396	4.67	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	190/1342	4.67	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	276/1459	4.67	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.44	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	217/1450	4.67	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.29	4.42	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	753/1399	4.33	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	421/1400	4.67	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	177/1179	4.67	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	507/1262	4.33	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.53	4.29	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	457/1256	4.67	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	254/ 788	4.33	3.97	4.00	4.07	4.33

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

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0101 University of Maryla Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT Baltimore County Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL Spring 2006

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2006

Page 707

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	22				
Questionnaires:	16	Student Cou	ourse I	Evaluation	Questionnaire

? 0

								equer					ructor	Course	_			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	292/1481	4.24	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.75
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	517/1481	4.18	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.50
		uestions reflec		_	0	13	0	0	0	1	2		****/1249	****	4.31	4.27	4.28	****
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	173/1424	4.51	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.81
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	2	2	7	3	2	3.06	1280/1396	3.49	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.06
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	60/1342	4.71	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.94
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	647/1459	3.77	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.38
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1480	4.78	4.44	4.68	4.65	5.00
				hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	10	5	4.33	546/1450	4.23	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.33
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	946/1409	4.13	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.36
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	400/1407	4.80	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.93
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	404/1399	4.17	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.64
		es contribute t			2	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	681/1400	3.94	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.43
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	10	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1179	2.75	3.87	3.96	4.02	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	1	11	4.62	289/1262	4.31	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.62
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	169/1259	4.74	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.92
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	173/1256	4.73	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.92
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful		3	1	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	85/ 788	4.53	3.97	4.00	4.07	4.83
				Frequ	ency	/ Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ty	pe.			Majors	<b>:</b>
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 8														
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ge:	nera	l				3	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	major	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot:	her				1	.0						

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0201 Title

ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT

Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 20 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 708 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

						Fre	equei	ncies	S		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera																
1 Did vo	u gain ne	Genera w insights,ski	_	m this source	0	0	0	0	5	Ω	7	4 10	1006/1481	4.24	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.10
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	9	8	4.25	822/1481		4.23	4.23	4.23	4.25
		estions reflec			0	16	0	0	0	2	2		****/1249		4.31	4.27	4.28	****
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	620/1424		4.33	4.21	4.27	4.35
				what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	7	6	3.70	959/1396		4.05	3.98	4.00	3.70
	_	_		o what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	333/1342		4.34	4.07	4.12	4.47
		system clearl			0	1	1	3	2	10	3		1236/1459		4.05	4.16	4.17	3.58
		was class cand		ined	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	770/1480		4.44	4.68		4.85
	-			hing effectiveness	2	0	0	n	4	8	6	4.11				4.09	4.10	
J. 110W WO	aia you g	rade the overa	II ccac	ning circultychess	_	O	O	Ü	-	O	Ü	1.11	77171130	1.25	1.15	1.05	1.10	1.11
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	1	3	8	8	4.15	1092/1409	4.13	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.15
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	930/1407	4.80	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.70
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	10	7	4.10	966/1399	4.17	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.10
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute t	contribute to what you learned					3	3	4	9	3.85	1104/1400	3.94	4.23	4.27	4.28	3.85
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	our understanding	1	11	1	3	2	1	1	2.75	1104/1179	2.75	3.87	3.96	4.02	2.75	
1 543		Discus			2	0	1	_	_	4	0	2 04	761/1060	4 21	4 00	4 05	4 1 4	2 04
				what you learned	3	0	1	2	2	4	8	3.94	761/1262			4.05	4.14	3.94
				d to participate	3	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	615/1259		4.53	4.29		4.47
				d open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53			4.56	4.30		4.53
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssiul		3	5	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	291/ 788	4.53	3.97	4.00	4.07	4.25
		Field	Work															
1. Did fie	eld exper			hat you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	2.00	4.30	4.48	****
1 1		Self			1.0	0	•	-		0	0	0 00		als als als als	2 20	4 55	4 00	de de de de
I. Did se.	li-paced	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	19	0	0	Τ	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	3.32	4.55	4.88	****
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	tribu	ation	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	es Reasons								Ту	pe			Majors	1
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	aior	 s	2	Graduat	e	1	Majo	r	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 13					-	<b>J</b>						5		-
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C 1		Ger	neral	1				3	Under-g	rad 1	L9	Non-	major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0									3				3	
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
P 0													respons	es to k	oe sign	ificar	ıt	
	I O					Oth	ner				1	4	-		3			
					Other													

? 0

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0401 University of Maryland Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT Baltimore County Instructor: SIMON, BARBARA

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

84-150

Grad.

2

0

3

8

D

F

Р

I

0

0

0

0

0

Spring 2006

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

0

13

Page 709

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	22				
Questionnaires:	14	Student C	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fr	eque:	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	Ο	4	8	2	3 86	1193/1481	4.24	4.16	4.29	4.29	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	4	4		1189/1481	4.18	4.23	4.23	4.23	3.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	620/1424		4.33	4.21	4.27	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	6	3	3.71	950/1396		4.05	3.98	4.00	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	-	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71			4.34	4.07	4.12	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	6	2		3.36	1312/1459		4.05	4.16	4.17	3.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	7		1044/1480		4.44	4.68	4.65	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	630/1450	4.23	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	-	0	0	2	1	2	1	2 00	1222/1409	4.13	4.29	4.42	4.43	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78		4.13	4.68	4.42	4.43	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	4	2	2		1156/1399		4.08	4.09	4.27	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	4	1		1217/1400		4.23	4.20	4.27	3.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	7	1	0	0	0	1		****/1179		3.87	3.96	4.02	****
5. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding	J	,	1	U	U	U		3.00	/11/5	2.75	3.07	3.90	1.02	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	477/1262		4.28	4.05	4.14	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	294/1259	4.74	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	394/1256		4.56	4.30	4.34	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	176/ 788	4.53	3.97	4.00	4.07	4.50
Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Gualita Ramada Gualan				<b>D</b> -									24	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	es Reasons								Ту:	pe 			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 8	Required for Majors				ajors 0 (		Graduate 0		0	Majo	r	8		
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 4														
56-83 7 2.00-2.99 1 C 2		Ge:	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	4	Non-	major	6

Other

Electives

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0101 University of Maryland Page 710
Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questionnaires: 2

			Fre	eanei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3 50	1358/1481	4.68	4 16	4.29	4.29	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1		1000/1481		4.23	4.23	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	0		1193/1249		4.31	4.27	4.28	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	,		4.33	4.21	4.27	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1292/1396	4.25	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	755/1342	4.81	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1256/1459	4.36	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1480	4.92	4.44	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	4.77	4.15	4.09	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1293/1409	4.69	4.29	4.42	4.43	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1296/1407	4.86	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1237/1399	4.69	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1230/1400	4.60	4.23	4.27	4.28	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1041/1179	4.50	3.87	3.96	4.02	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	345/1262	4.94	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	895/1259	4.88	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	901/1256	4.88	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	394/ 788	4.80	3.97	4.00	4.07	4.00
_		<u> </u>	,											

Frequency	Distribution
-----------	--------------

Credits Ea	arned	ned Cum. GPA			l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				2	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0201 University of Maryland Page 711
Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	2	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

I ?

0

Enrollment:

3

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions				NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	549/1481	4.68	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.50
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	0	1		1000/1481		4.23	4.23	4.23	4.00
		uestions reflec			0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249		4.31	4.27	4.28	5.00
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	1	1		437/1424		4.33	4.21	4.27	4.50
				what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396		4.05	3.98	4.00	5.00
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1342		4.34	4.07	4.12	5.00
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	1	0	1		961/1459		4.05	4.16	4.17	4.00
		was class canc			0	1	0	0	0	0	1		1/1480		4.44	4.68	4.65	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1		334/1450		4.15	4.09	4.10	4.50
J. 110W WO	ara you	grade the overa	II ccac	ming cricectveness	O	J	O	Ü	O	_	_	1.50	331/1130	1.77	1.15	1.05	1.10	1.50
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	4.69	4.29	4.42	4.43	5.00
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1407		4.68	4.69	4.67	5.00
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1399		4.28	4.26	4.27	5.00
		es contribute t			1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1400	4.60	4.23	4.27	4.28	5.00
				our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1179		3.87	3.96	4.02	5.00
5. 21a aa.	a_0 v _ D a a .	1 000111114000 011	1101100 1	our unacreounaring	_	Ü	Ū	ŭ	Ü	Ū	_	3.00	2,22.3	1.50	3.07	3.50	1.02	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	4.94	4.28	4.05	4.14	5.00
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1259	4.88	4.53	4.29	4.34	5.00
		_	_	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1256	4.88	4.56	4.30	4.34	5.00
		echniques succe			1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 788		3.97	4.00	4.07	5.00
		1											,					
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	<b>:</b>			
	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra																	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0					El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
Р 0				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
I 0						Ot]	her					1						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0301 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL Enrollment: 4

Questionnaires: 3

Page 712 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Instr	uctor	Course	Dept
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean

	Questions NR								ructor	Course Dep		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	3	5.00	1/1481	4.68	4.16	4.29	4.29	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1481	4.67	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1424	4.77	4.33	4.21	4.27	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	4.81	4.34	4.07	4.12	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	276/1459	4.36	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1480	4.92	4.44	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	546/1450	4.77	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.33
Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	4.86	4.68	4.69	4.67	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1017/1400	4.60	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1262	4.94	4.28	4.05	4.14	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1259	4.88	4.53	4.29	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256	4.88	4.56	4.30	4.34	5.00

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

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0401 University of Maryland Page 713 TUTORIAL IN WRITING JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029 SHIVNAN, SALLY

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

4

							Fre	_	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	4.68	4.16	4.29	4.29	5.00
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481		4.23	4.23	4.23	5.00
		estions reflec			0	1	0	0	0	0	1		1/1249		4.31	4.27	4.28	5.00
	_	ations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1424		4.33	4.21	4.27	5.00
				what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1		1/1396		4.05	3.98	4.00	5.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342		4.34	4.07	4.12	5.00
		g system clearl			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459		4.05	4.16	4.17	5.00
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1480	4.92	4.44	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1450	4.77	4.15	4.09	4.10	5.00
	Lecture																	
1 Were t	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	4.69	4.29	4.42	4.43	5.00
					1	0	0	0	0	0	_	5.00	1/1407		4.68	4.69	4.67	5.00
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1399		4.28	4.26	4.27	5.00
		es contribute t			1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1400		4.23	4.27	4.28	5.00
				our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1179			3.96	4.02	5.00
J. Dia aa	alovibaai	r cccinitqueb cir	nance y	our understanding	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	1/11/5	1.50	3.07	3.70	1.02	3.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1262	4.94	4.28	4.05	4.14	5.00
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1259	4.88	4.53	4.29	4.34	5.00
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	4.88	4.56	4.30	4.34	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 788	4.80	3.97	4.00	4.07	5.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio	ı									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
				- 										- 				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 1		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1
	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0												_	_				
56-83						Gei	nera:	l				1	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	βh
				P 0							respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt			
I 0					Otl	her					1							
? 1																		

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0501 Page 714 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY Enrollment: 3

Ouestionnaires: 3	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	395/1481	4.68	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals			0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1481	4.67	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	287/1424	4.77	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1342	4.81	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	961/1459	4.36	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1480	4.92	4.44	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	217/1450	4.77	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	559/1409	4.69	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	4.86	4.68	4.69	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	376/1399	4.69	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	421/1400	4.60	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1262	4.94	4.28	4.05	4.14	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate			0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1259	4.88	4.53	4.29	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256		4.56	4.30	4.34	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 788		3.97	4.00	4.07	5.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtioı	n									

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
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	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	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	3				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Page 715 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	3				
Questionnaires:	3	Student Co	ourse	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0601

TUTORIAL IN WRITING

SHIVNAN, SALLY

Title

Instructor:

							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		rom this course	0	0	0	0	0	Ο	3	5.00	1/1481	4.68	4.16	4.29	4.29	5.00
2. Did the instruct			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	4.67	4.23	4.23	4.23	5.00
4. Did other evalua			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1424		4.33	4.21	4.27	5.00
5. Did assigned rea			0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	707/1396		4.05	3.98	4.00	4.00
9	3	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342		4.34	4.07	4.12	5.00
7. Was the grading		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1459		4.05	4.16	4.17	5.00
8. How many times w			0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1158/1480	4.92	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness				0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	217/1450	4.77	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.67
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruc	tor's lectures well	L prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	4.69	4.29	4.42	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instruct	or seem interested	in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	4.86	4.68	4.69	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture mate	rial presented and	explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	4.69	4.28	4.26	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures	contribute to what	you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	4.60	4.23	4.27	4.28	5.00
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	4.50	3.87	3.96	4.02	5.00
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	sions contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1262	4.94	4.28	4.05	4.14	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1259	4.88	4.53	4.29	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256	4.88	4.56	4.30	4.34	5.00
Freque:					cribu	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Rea	asons	3			Τv	pe			Maiors	

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

#### Course-Section: ENGL 392 0901 University of Maryland Page 716 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K

Enr	collme	ent:	5	
_				

Questionnaires:	4	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	3	4.75	292/1481	4.68	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1481	4.67	4.23	4.23	4.23	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1424	4.77	4.33	4.21	4.27	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342	4.81	4.34	4.07	4.12	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	196/1459	4.36	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1480	4.92	4.44	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1450	4.77	4.15	4.09	4.10	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1262	4.94	4.28	4.05	4.14	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1259	4.88	4.53	4.29	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	4.88	4.56	4.30	4.34	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 788	4.80	3.97	4.00	4.07	5.00
Frequ	Dist	rib	ution	ı										

Credits Earned Cum. GPA				Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	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	4	-			
				2	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 392 1001 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA Enrollment: 4

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00

Questionnaires: 1

Page 717 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

1/1256 4.88 4.56 4.30 4.34 5.00

			Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	4.68	4.16	4.29	4.29	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	4.67	4.23	4.23	4.23	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	4.77	4.33	4.21	4.27	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	4.81	4.34	4.07	4.12	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	961/1459	4.36	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	4.92	4.44	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	4.77	4.15	4.09	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	4.69	4.29	4.42	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	4.86	4.68	4.69	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	4.69	4.28	4.26	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	4.60	4.23	4.27	4.28	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	4.94	4.28	4.05	4.14	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	4.88	4.53	4.29	4.34	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons	Туре	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	 Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
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 sid	qnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_		-	
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0101 University of Maryland Title TECHNICAL WRITING

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor: HICKERNELL, MAR Enrollment: 23

Ouestionnaires: 15

84-150

Grad.

3

3.00-3.49 3

3.50-4.00 4

Student	Course	Fraluation	Ouestionnaire

Page 718

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 5 7 2 3.67 1299/1481 3.54 4.16 4.29 4.29 3.67 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 7 1 6 3.93 1094/1481 3.86 4.23 4.23 4.23 3.93 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 9 0 1 1 1 1 3 4.00 893/1249 3.93 4.31 4.27 4.28 4.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 4 5 5 4.07 923/1424 4.04 4.33 4.21 4.27 4.07 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 2 6 4 2 3.27 1195/1396 3.39 4.05 3.98 4.00 3.27 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 2 3 5 5 3.87 912/1342 4.00 4.34 4.07 4.12 3.87 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 1 0 3 4 3 2 3.33 1318/1459 3.66 4.05 4.16 4.17 3.33 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 1 13 4.80 839/1480 4.18 4.44 4.68 4.65 4.80 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 0 4 3 2 3.78 1081/1450 3.57 4.15 4.09 4.10 3.78 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 1 4 3 7 4.07 1134/1409 4.00 4.29 4.42 4.43 4.07 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 2 1 3 9  $4.27\ 1253/1407\ 4.18\ 4.68\ 4.69\ 4.67\ 4.27$ 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 5 3 6 3.93 1067/1399 3.95 4.28 4.26 4.27 3.93 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 1 4 5 4 3.86 1104/1400 3.78 4.23 4.27 4.28 3.86 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 1 2 1 2 3 4 3.50 894/1179 3.69 3.87 3.96 4.02 3.50 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 7 1 1 3.33 1059/1262 3.65 4.28 4.05 4.14 3.33 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 1 1 3 4 4.11 861/1259 4.15 4.53 4.29 4.34 4.11 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 2 2 5 4.33 723/1256 4.15 4.56 4.30 4.34 4.33 4. Were special techniques successful 6 3 2 1 1 2 0 2.50 763/788 3.64 3.97 4.00 4.07 2.50 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\* 2.50 4.20 4.20 \*\*\*\* 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 249 \*\*\*\* 3.00 4.11 4.23 \*\*\*\* 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 14 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 242 \*\*\*\* 3.00 4.40 4.36 \*\*\*\* 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\* 240 \*\*\*\* 3.50 4.20 3.96 \*\*\*\* 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 217 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.04 4.11 \*\*\*\* Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 14 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\* 68 \*\*\*\* 4.72 4.49 4.70 \*\*\*\* 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 63 \*\*\*\* 4.33 4.44 4.56 \*\*\*\* Frequency Distribution Cum. GPA Expected Grades Credits Earned Reasons 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 00-27 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 1.00-1.99 0 B 7 2.00-2.99 0 C 4 28-55 0 56-83 5 General 1 Under-grad 15 Non-major 14

Electives

Other

0

10

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

D 0

F 0

P 0

I 0

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Page 719 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0201

23

TECHNICAL WRITING

KIRKPATRICK, RO

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 10

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1324/1481	3.54	4.16	4.29	4.29	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	1118/1481	3.86	4.23	4.23	4.23	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1249	3.93	4.31	4.27	4.28	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	885/1424	4.04	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	5	2	1	3.00	1292/1396	3.39	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	2	4	3.60	1071/1342	4.00	4.34	4.07	4.12	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1201/1459	3.66	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	6	2	0	3.00	1469/1480	4.18	4.44	4.68	4.65	3.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	6	2	0	3.11	1340/1450	3.57	4.15	4.09	4.10	3.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	3	4	1	3.40	1311/1409	4.00	4.29	4.42	4.43	3.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	0	3	5	4.10	1294/1407	4.18	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.10
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	1217/1399	3.95	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1230/1400	3.78	4.23	4.27	4.28	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	1148/1179	3.69	3.87	3.96	4.02	2.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	958/1262	3.65	4.28	4.05	4.14	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	1	2		1027/1259	4.15	4.53	4.29	4.34	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	1	2		1025/1256		4.56	4.30	4.34	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	604/ 788		3.97	4.00	4.07	3.50
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
•	-								m	<b></b>			Mo i or	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				кеа	asons	პ 			Ту	ре 			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 4		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	2	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	2

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	С	0	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	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	nificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				2	Λ						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 720

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 19 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0301

TECHNICAL WRITING

KIRKPATRICK, RO

Title

Instructor:

Questions					NR	NA	Fro	eque: 2		s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	_		_		_		_	_								
		w insights,ski			0	0	2	4	6	5	2		1446/1481			4.29	4.29	3.05
		tor make clear			0	0	2	3	9	4			1433/1481		4.23	4.23	4.23	2.95
		estions reflec			0	14	1 0	1	1	2	0		1212/1249	3.93		4.27	4.28	2.80
		ations reflect			0	1 1	2	4 5	6	6 6	1		1316/1424		4.33	4.21	4.27	3.33
				hat you learned	0	0	2 1	3	4 2	9	_		1313/1396			3.98	4.00	2.94
				what you learned	0	1	3	3		3			1055/1342 1380/1459		4.34	4.07 4.16		3.63
		g system clearly was class canc		nea	0	0	0	0	2	3 17			,			4.16	4.17	3.89
				EE	7	0	1	2	8	1			1421/1480		4.44			
9. HOW WO	uia you g	grade the overa	II teach	ing effectiveness	/	U	Τ	2	8	Т	U	2.75	1406/1450	3.5/	4.15	4.09	4.10	2.75
		Lectur	_															
		ctor's lecture	_	-	1	0	1	4	6	2	5		1325/1409		4.29	4.42	4.43	3.33
		tor seem inter			1	0	0	2	2	9	5	3.94	1312/1407	4.18	4.68	4.69	4.67	3.94
	<del>-</del>					0	0	4	9	3	2	3.17	1308/1399	3.95	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.17
	id the lectures contribute to what you learned				1		2	3	8	4	1	2.94	1325/1400		4.23	4.27	4.28	2.94
5. Did au	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi					5	1	0	5	5	1	3.42	939/1179	3.69	3.87	3.96	4.02	3.42
	Discussion																	
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	11	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1044/1262	3.65	4.28	4.05	4.14	3.38
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	couraged	to participate	11	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	895/1259	4.15	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.00
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage	fair and	open discussion	11	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	996/1256	4.15	4.56	4.30	4.34	3.88
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	-	11	3	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	394/ 788	3.64	3.97	4.00	4.07	4.00
		Labora	torv															
2. Were ye	ou provid		-	round information	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	***	3.00	4.11	4.23	****
				Freq	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
				-					_									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	1
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А б		Re	quir	ed f	or M	 ajors	;	2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	or	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	в 10			-			-						3		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	-major	17
84-150																	-	
Grad.						El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	rh
	P 0												respons					
	P 0 I 0					Ot]	her				1	.3	-					
				? 0														

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0501

24

TECHNICAL WRITING

PORTER, JANE P.

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 721

O L	a	The second second second	Ouestionnaire	
Scudent	COULSE	Evaluation	Ouescrommarre	

	Overtions						Fre	equer	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did v	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	1	2	2	6	6	3.82	1212/1481	3.54	4.16	4.29	4.29	3.82
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	646/1481		4.23	4.23	4.23	4.41
		estions reflec			0	12	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	405/1249		4.31	4.27	4.28	4.60
	_	ations reflect		_	0	0	0	2	1		10	4.29	695/1424		4.33	4.21	4.27	4.29
				what you learned	0	0	2	2	7	4	2		1266/1396		4.05	3.98	4.00	3.12
				o what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	,		4.34	4.07	4.12	4.41
		g system clearl			0	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	792/1459	3.66	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.24
		was class canc			0	0	1	0	0	4	12	4.53	1034/1480	4.18	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.53
	-			hing effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	567/1450	3.57	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.31
	-			_														
		Lectur	е															
1. Were	the instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	1	0	6	10	4.47	800/1409	4.00	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.47
2. Did t	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear					0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	1091/1407	4.18	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.53
3. Was 1	Was lecture material presented and explained clear					0	0	1	0	6	10	4.47	601/1399	3.95	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.47
4. Did t	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	2	0	1	6	8	4.06	1001/1400	3.78	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.06
5. Did a	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	549/1179	3.69	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.12
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1262	3.65	4.28	4.05	4.14	****
2. Were	all studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1259	4.15	4.53	4.29	4.34	****
		_		d open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/1256		4.56	4.30	4.34	****
4. Were	special te	echniques succe	ssful		14	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 788	3.64	3.97	4.00	4.07	****
				Frequ	lency	7 Dist	tribu	ıtioı	n									
Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	\$			Ту	ре			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11		Red	 guire	ed fo	or Ma	ior	 s	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4		2.00	-1		10		_	_	or addac	-	-		_	•
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-q	rad 1	L7	Non-	major	17
84-150												-	2				5	
Grad.						Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enou	<sub>f</sub> h
	P 0												respons				_	•
	P 0					Otl	ner				1	6	-					
				? 0			-				_							

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Page 722

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 16 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0601

TECHNICAL WRITING

PORTER, JANE P.

Title

Instructor:

		Question	a		NID	NA	Fr 1	eque: 2	ncies	5	5	Ins Mean	ructor Rank		-		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Question 	S 		NIX.	INA				- <del>1</del>		Mean	Ralik		Mean	Mean	меан	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	2	3	7	4	3.81	1218/1481	3.54	4.16	4.29	4.29	3.81
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	822/1481	3.86	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.25
		uestions reflec			0	14	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1249	3.93	4.31	4.27	4.28	****
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	645/1424	4.04	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.33
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	3	2	5	2	4	3.13	1261/1396	3.39	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.13
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	434/1342	4.00	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.38
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	647/1459	3.66	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.38
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	981/1480	4.18	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.63
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	8	2	3.79	1072/1450	3.57	4.15	4.09	4.10	3.79
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	the instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	559/1409	4.00	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.67
2. Did th	ne instru	nstructor seem interested in the subject re material presented and explained clearl				0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	728/1407	4.18	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.80
3. Was le	ecture material presented and explained clear.				1	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	534/1399	3.95	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.53
4. Did th	the lectures contribute to what you learned				1	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	704/1400	3.78	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.40
5. Did au	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi				1	0	0	1	4	2	8	4.13	533/1179	3.69	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.13
		Discus																
				what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	887/1262	3.65	4.28	4.05	4.14	3.75
				d to participate	8	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	783/1259		4.53	4.29	4.34	4.25
				d open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	837/1256	4.15	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.14
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		9	3	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	533/ 788	3.64	3.97	4.00	4.07	3.75
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Re:	 auir	ed f	or Ma	ior		2	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 7										-	-	) -		_
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 2		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	15
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D 0									3				3	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ιh
				P 0									respons				_	•
				I O	Other				1	.2			5					
				? 0		Other												

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0801

24

TECHNICAL WRITING

HARRIS, LINDA R

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 9

Page 723 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

							Fre	eque:	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	2	1	2	1	3	3.22	1424/1481	3.54	4.16	4.29	4.29	3.22
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1253/1481	3.86	4.23	4.23	4.23	3.67
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	679/1249	3.93	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.33
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1101/1424	4.04	4.33	4.21	4.27	3.89
5. Did as	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	193/1396	3.39	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.67
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	898/1342	4.00	4.34	4.07	4.12	3.89
7. Was th	e gradino	system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	2	1	2	0	4	3.33	1318/1459	3.66	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.33
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	1	8	0	3.89	1422/1480	4.18	4.44	4.68	4.65	3.89
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1223/1450	3.57	4.15	4.09	4.10	3.50
		Lectur	_															
1 Were t	he instr	ctor's lecture	_	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	968/1409	4.00	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.33
		ctor seem inter			0	0	1	0	2	2	4		1327/1407	4.18	4.68	4.69	4.67	3.89
	as lecture material presented and explained clear				0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	855/1399	3.95	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.22
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				0	0	1	0	2	2	4		1095/1400		4.23	4.27	4.28	3.89
	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding			-	0	0	1	1	0	3	4		705/1179		3.87	3.96	4.02	3.89
		Discus	ni on															
1 Did al	aga diga:			what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	1	Λ	2 50	****/1262	3.65	4.28	4.05	4.14	****
				d to participate	7	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/1259	4.15	4.53	4.29	4.34	****
		_	_	d open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/1256		4.56	4.30	4.34	****
		chniques succe		d open discussion	7	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 788		3.97	4.00	4.07	****
4. Were s	peciai te	echniques succe	SSLUI		,	1	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	"""/ /00	3.04	3.97	4.00	4.07	
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Re	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	1
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 0	 А б					 or Ma			1	 Graduat		0	Majo		1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	A 6 B 1		rec	quit (	eu L	OT MG	JOTE	>	_	Graduat	C	U	Ma JC	/_	1
56-83	-					Cos	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad	9	Mon	-major	8
84-150				D 0		Gei	пета.	T				U	onder-9	Lau	J	NOII-	iia jur	O
	0		2	Б 0 F 0		. רים	ecti					0	#### - :	Moona +	horo o	ro not	onom	h
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 P 0						E16	ecrl,	ves				U	respons				_	11
				I 0		O+1	hom					7	respons	es to D	e sign	ııııcan	16	
				Ι 0	O Other							1						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0901 University of Maryland Title TECHNICAL WRITING

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 724

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: BELFRAGE, MARY Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 16 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

84-150

Grad.

5

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

2

1

D

F

I

0

0

0

							Fr	equei	ncie	æ		Tnei	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
			Ouestions		MR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
			General															
1. D	oid you	ı gain ne	ew insights,skill:	s from this course	1	0	2	2	2	4	5	3.53	1347/1481	3.54	4.16	4.29	4.29	3.53
2. D	oid the	e instruc	ctor make clear t	ne expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	1000/1481	3.86	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.00
3. D	oid the	e exam qu	uestions reflect	the expected goals	1	12	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1249	3.93	4.31	4.27	4.28	****
4. D	oid oth	ıer evalı	uations reflect t	ne expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	874/1424	4.04	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.13
5. D	oid ass	signed re	eadings contribut	e to what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	4	4	3.40	1136/1396	3.39	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.40
6. D	oid wri	tten ass	signments contrib	ute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	534/1342	4.00	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.27
7. W	las the	grading	g system clearly (	explained	1	1	0	3	2	3	6	3.86	1086/1459	3.66	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.86
8. H	Iow man	y times	was class cancel	led	1	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	1114/1480	4.18	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.40
9. H	Iow wou	ıld you g	grade the overall	teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	786/1450	3.57	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.09
			Lecture															
			uctor's lectures		1	0	0	1	2	6	6		1104/1409		4.29	4.42	4.43	4.13
				ted in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	1277/1407	4.18	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.20
				and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	5	5		1115/1399		4.28	4.26	4.27	3.87
4. D	oid the	e lecture	es contribute to v	what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	3	6	3.93	1067/1400	3.78	4.23	4.27	4.28	3.93
5. D	oid aud	liovisua	l techniques enha	nce your understanding	1	6	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	590/1179	3.69	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.00
			on															
1. D	oid cla	ıss disc	e to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	610/1262	3.65	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.20	
2. W	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned Were all students actively encouraged to participate					0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	509/1259	4.15	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.60
3. D	Were all students actively encouraged to participate Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion				6	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	516/1256	4.15	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.60
4. W	Were sp	ecial te	echniques success	ful	6	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	201/ 788	3.64	3.97	4.00	4.07	4.44
			Laborato	-														
				ing of the material	13	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246		2.50	4.20	4.20	****
	_	_	_	background information	14	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 249	****	3.00	4.11	4.23	****
4. D	id the	e lab ins	structor provide a	assistance	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	3.50	4.20	3.96	****
_			Seminar					_										
		_	_	the announced theme	13	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 68		4.72	4.49	4.70	****
				r individual attention	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.75	4.53	4.66	
				e to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 63		4.33	4.44	4.56	****
			ons contribute to		14	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 69		4.71	4.35	4.48	****
5. W	Were cr	riteria 1	for grading made	clear	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.03	3.92	4.43	****
			Field Wo:															
		_		to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 59	****	2.00	4.30	4.48	***
				evaluation criteria	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 51	****	2.00	4.00	4.13	****
4. I	. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations				14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	***
	Fre					Dis	trib	utio	n									
Cred	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 10						Re	 quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	 3	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 4						_				J						3 -		
						Ger	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	16
	-83 2 2.00-2.99 4 C 0						u	_				_	J.14C1 9	_ ~~ 1	-	14011	ــ ال ما	

Electives

Other

0

10

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

# Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 393 1201

26

TECHNICAL WRITING

HARRIS, LINDA R

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 14

Page 725 University of Maryland JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Ctudent	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							equer					tructor	Course	-	-	Level	Sect	
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	1	2	2	6	3	3.57	1334/1481	3.54	4.16	4.29	4.29	3.57
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	1	2	6	4		1189/1481		4.23	4.23	4.23	3.79
		uestions reflec			0	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1249	3.93	4.31	4.27	4.28	****
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	863/1424	4.04	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.14
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to i	what you learned	0	7	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1042/1396	3.39	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.57
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute to	o what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	7	4	3.93	858/1342	4.00	4.34	4.07	4.12	3.93
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla:	ined	0	0	2	3	1	2	6	3.50	1256/1459	3.66	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.50
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	10	4	4.29	1193/1480	4.18	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.29
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	1	1	7	2	2	3.23	1312/1450	3.57	4.15	4.09	4.10	3.23
		Lectur																
1 Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture		orenared	1	0	1	2	2	4	4	3 62	1279/1409	4.00	4 20	4.42	4.43	3.62
					1	0	1	1	4	2			1350/1407		4.68		4.67	3.69
						0	0	1	-	_			1159/1399		4.28	4.26	4.27	3.77
	Was lecture material presented and explained clea Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	1	2	3	1			1173/1400			4.27	4.28	3.69
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					1	0	0	3	3			495/1179		3.87			4.18
		_	_															
		Discus																
				what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	0		****/1262		4.28		4.14	****
				d to participate	11	0	0	-	1	1	1		****/1259		4.53	4.29	4.34	****
				d open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	1		****/1256		4.56	4.30	4.34	****
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssiul		11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	3.64	3.97	4.00	4.07	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	9			Ту	ne			Majors	<b>:</b>
																		, 
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajors		1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55																		
	56-83 4 2.00-2.99 3 C 0					Gei	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	4	Non-	major	14
	84-150 6 3.00-3.49 4 D 0											_			_			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1				_	jh
	P 0											_	respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
			I 0		Ot1	her				1	.2							

Course-Section: ENGL 393E 0101 University of Maryland Title TECHNICAL WRITING Baltimore County

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor: BELFRAGE, MARY

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 14

Page 726 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies					Instructor		ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	2	3	3	4	3.75	1254/1481	3.75	4.16	4.29	4.29	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	3	1	6	3.92	1106/1481	3.92	4.23	4.23	4.23	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	1152/1424	3.82	4.33	4.21	4.27	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	6	4	4.00	707/1396	4.00	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	1	4	4	3.67	1201/1459	3.67	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	5	5	1	3.64	1447/1480	3.64	4.44	4.68	4.65	3.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	2	3	2	0	2.56	1425/1450	2.56	4.15	4.09	4.10	2.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	2	1	6	3.67	1270/1409	3.67	4.29	4.42	4.43	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	3	2	5		1334/1407	3.83	4.68	4.69	4.67	3.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	2	5		1086/1399	3.92	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	3	3		1230/1400		4.23	4.27	4.28	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	6	1	3	3.55	880/1179		3.87	3.96		3.55
o. Pia addiovibadi ocomitaco cimanoc fodi andersodiaring	J	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	_	_	3.33	000, 11, 5	3.33	3.07	3.30	1.02	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	418/1262	4.43	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	661/1259	4.43	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	406/1256	4.71	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	671/ 788	3.33	3.97	4.00	4.07	3.33
- 1														
Laboratory				_			_							****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 246	***	2.50	4.20	4.20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	3.00	4.11	4.23	***
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.75	4.53	4.66	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.33	4.44	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.71	4.35	4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.03	3.92	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	2.00	4.30	4.48	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 51	****	2.00	4.00	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****
Self Paced						_								
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 55	****	3.32	4.55	4.88	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.56	4.75	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	4.31	4.65	4.88	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	4.14	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****

Course-Section: ENGL 393E 0101

Title TECHNICAL WRITING

Instructor: BELFF
Enrollment: 21

BELFRAGE, MARY

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 726 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

## Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 401 0101

Title METHOD OF INTERPRETATI

Instructor: HOLTON, ADALAIN

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 18

2

Spring 2006

Page 727 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  0 0 0 0 0 0 6 12 4.67 395/1481 4.  2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals  0 0 0 0 0 0 3 15 4.83 162/1481 4.  3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0 0 0 0 0 1 3 14 4.72 270/1249 4.  4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals  0 0 0 0 0 1 3 15 4.83 165/1424 4.  5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 49/1396 4.  6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0 0 0 0 1 2 15 4.78 125/1342 4.  7. Was the grading system clearly explained  0 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 421/1480 4.  8. How many times was class cancelled  0 0 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 421/1480 4.  9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  3 0 0 0 0 5 10 4.67 217/1450 4.	72 4.31 83 4.33 94 4.05 78 4.34	4.29 4.23 4.27 4.21 3.98 4.07 4.16 4.68 4.09	4.45 4.32 4.44 4.35 4.09 4.21 4.25 4.74 4.28	4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 6 12 4.67 395/1481 4. 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 15 4.83 162/1481 4. 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 3 14 4.72 270/1249 4. 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 15 4.83 165/1424 4. 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 49/1396 4. 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 2 15 4.78 125/1342 4. 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 2 16 4.89 113/1459 4. 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 421/1480 4. 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 5 10 4.67 217/1450 4.	83 4.23 72 4.31 83 4.33 94 4.05 78 4.34 89 4.05 94 4.44 67 4.15	4.23 4.27 4.21 3.98 4.07 4.16 4.68 4.09	4.32 4.44 4.35 4.09 4.21 4.25 4.74 4.28	4. 4. 4. 4. 4.
Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 6 12 4.67 395/1481 4. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 15 4.83 162/1481 4. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 3 14 4.72 270/1249 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 15 4.83 165/1424 4. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 49/1396 4. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 2 15 4.78 125/1342 4. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 16 4.89 113/1459 4. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 421/1480 4. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 5 10 4.67 217/1450 4.	83 4.23 72 4.31 83 4.33 94 4.05 78 4.34 89 4.05 94 4.44 67 4.15	4.23 4.27 4.21 3.98 4.07 4.16 4.68 4.09	4.32 4.44 4.35 4.09 4.21 4.25 4.74 4.28	4. 4. 4. 4. 4.
Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 15 4.83 162/1481 4. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 3 14 4.72 270/1249 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 15 4.83 165/1424 4. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 49/1396 4. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.94 49/1396 4. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 15 4.78 125/1342 4. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 421/1480 4. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 5 10 4.67 217/1450 4.	83 4.23 72 4.31 83 4.33 94 4.05 78 4.34 89 4.05 94 4.44 67 4.15	4.23 4.27 4.21 3.98 4.07 4.16 4.68 4.09	4.32 4.44 4.35 4.09 4.21 4.25 4.74 4.28	4. 4. 4. 4. 4.
Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 3 14 4.72 270/1249 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 15 4.83 165/1424 4. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 49/1396 4. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 2 15 4.78 125/1342 4. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 2 16 4.89 113/1459 4. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 421/1480 4. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 5 10 4.67 217/1450 4.	72 4.31 83 4.33 94 4.05 78 4.34 89 4.05 94 4.44 67 4.15 94 4.29 94 4.68	4.27 4.21 3.98 4.07 4.16 4.68 4.09	4.44 4.35 4.09 4.21 4.25 4.74 4.28	4. 4. 4. 4. 4.
Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 15 4.83 165/1424 4. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 49/1396 4. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 2 15 4.78 125/1342 4. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 2 16 4.89 113/1459 4. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 421/1480 4. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 5 10 4.67 217/1450 4.	83 4.33 94 4.05 78 4.34 89 4.05 94 4.44 67 4.15 94 4.29 94 4.68	4.21 3.98 4.07 4.16 4.68 4.09	4.35 4.09 4.21 4.25 4.74 4.28	4.4.4.4.4.
Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 49/1396 4. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 2 15 4.78 125/1342 4. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 2 16 4.89 113/1459 4. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 421/1480 4. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 5 10 4.67 217/1450 4.	94 4.05 78 4.34 89 4.05 94 4.44 67 4.15 94 4.29 94 4.68	3.98 4.07 4.16 4.68 4.09	4.09 4.21 4.25 4.74 4.28	4. 4. 4.
Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 2 15 4.78 125/1342 4. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 2 16 4.89 113/1459 4. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 421/1480 4. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 5 10 4.67 217/1450 4.  Lecture	78 4.34 89 4.05 94 4.44 67 4.15 94 4.29 94 4.68	4.07 4.16 4.68 4.09	4.21 4.25 4.74 4.28	4. 4. 4.
Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 2 16 4.89 113/1459 4. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 421/1480 4. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 5 10 4.67 217/1450 4.  Lecture	89 4.05 94 4.44 67 4.15 94 4.29 94 4.68	4.16 4.68 4.09	4.25 4.74 4.28	4. 4.
. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 17 $4.94$ $421/1480$ 4. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 5 10 $4.67$ $217/1450$ 4. Lecture	94 4.44 67 4.15 94 4.29 94 4.68	4.68	4.74 4.28	4.
How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 5 10 4.67 217/1450 4.  Lecture	67 4.15 94 4.29 94 4.68	4.09	4.28	
	94 4.68	4.42		
	94 4.68	4.42		
	94 4.68	4.42		4.
		1 (0		
	87 4 7X			4.
Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 16 4.89 166/1400 4.				4.
Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding $0$ 3 $0$ 1 3 $1$ 10 $4.33$ 384/1179 $4$ .	33 3.87	3.96	4.07	4.
Discussion				
Did class discussions contribute to what you learned $0$ $0$ $0$ $0$ $1$ $0$ $17$ $4.89$ $134/1262$ $4$ .	89 4.28	4.05	4.33	4 .
Were all students actively encouraged to participate $0  0  0  0  2  16  4.89  229/1259  4.$	89 4.53	4.29	4.57	4 .
Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion $0$ $0$ $0$ $0$ $0$ $0$ $2$ $16$ $4.89$ $232/1256$ $4$ .	89 4.56	4.30	4.60	4 .
Were special techniques successful 0 1 0 1 2 2 12 4.47 188/ 788 4.	47 3.97	4.00	4.26	4
Laboratory				
Did the lab increase understanding of the material $17 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 5.00 **** / 246 **$	** 2.50	4.20	4.45	* *
Seminar				
Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 68 **	** 4.72	4.49	4.68	* *
Was the instructor available for individual attention $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	** 4.75	4.53	4.64	* *
Field Work				
Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 59 **	** 2.00	4.30	4.93	* *
Self Paced				
Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 55 **	** 3.32	4.55	4.86	* *
Did study questions make clear the expected goal $17~0~0~0~0~1~5.00~****/~31~**$	** 3.56	4.75	5.00	* *
Frequency Distribution				
edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type			Majors	3
				 1
0-27	0	Maj	OT	_
	1.0	Men	mo i o	
6-83 0 2.00-2.99 2 C 2 General 0 Under-grad 4-150 10 3.00-3.49 4 D 0	18	non	-major	
	a thoma	020 25	+ 020	~h
			_	ìII
P 0 responses t	o pe sig	milica	nt	

Other

17

I

?

0

Course-Section: ENGL 405 0101 University of Maryland Title SEMINAR IN LITERARY HI Baltimore County

SEMINAR IN LITERARY HI Baltimore County FALCO, RAPHAEL Spring 2006

Instructor: FALCO, RAPHAEL

5. Were criteria for grading made clear

Enrollment: 16
Ouestionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 728 JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

36/ 68 4.00 4.03 3.92 4.10 4.00

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1481 5.00 4.16 4.29 4.45 5.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 1 8 4.70 286/1481 4.70 4.23 4.23 4.32 4.70 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 5 1 0 0 0 4 4.20 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 2 0 0 2 6 4.75 788/1249 4.20 4.31 4.27 4.44 4.20 217/1424 4.75 4.33 4.21 4.35 4.75 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 9 4.90 82/1396 4.90 4.05 3.98 4.09 4.90 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 00 1 2 6 4.56 270/1342 4.56 4.34 4.07 4.21 4.56 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 9 4.90 101/1459 4.90 4.05 4.16 4.25 4.90 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 8 2 4.20 1260/1480 4.20 4.44 4.68 4.74 4.20 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 0 0 1 7 4.88 111/1450 4.88 4.15 4.09 4.28 4.88 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Ω Ω Ω Ω Ω 8 4.80 334/1409 4.80 4.29 4.42 4.51 4.80 2 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1407 5.00 4.68 4.69 4.79 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 1 9 4.90 129/1399 4.90 4.28 4.26 4.36 4.90 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1400 5.00 4.23 4.27 4.38 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 8 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1179 \*\*\*\* 3.87 3.96 4.07 \*\*\*\* Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 6 4.86 146/1262 4.86 4.28 4.05 4.33 4.86 7 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 1/1259 5.00 4.53 4.29 4.57 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 406/1256 4.71 4.56 4.30 4.60 4.71 4. Were special techniques successful 3 5 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 \*\*\*\*/ 788 \*\*\*\* 3.97 4.00 4.26 \*\*\*\* Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 7 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/ 68 5.00 4.72 4.49 4.68 5.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 7 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 34/ 69 4.67 4.75 4.53 4.64 4.67 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 7 28/ 63 4.67 4.33 4.44 4.49 4.67 0 0 1 2 4.67 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 7 0 1/ 69 5.00 4.71 4.35 4.53 5.00 0 0 0 0 3 5.00

#### Frequency Distribution

0 0

1 0 0 2 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	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there a	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 407 0101 University of Maryland Title LANGUAGE IN SOCIETY

Instructor:

SHIPKA, JODY

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 729

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 13 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	eque:	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls from	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	362/1481	4.80	4.16	4.29	4.45	4.69
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	971/1481	4.41	4.23	4.23	4.32	4.08
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the ex	xpected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	245/1249	4.75	4.31	4.27	4.44	4.75
4. Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	406/1424	4.77	4.33	4.21	4.35	4.54
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to v	what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	233/1396	4.77	4.05	3.98	4.09	4.62
6. Did wr:	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	283/1342	4.73	4.34	4.07	4.21	4.54
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y expla:	ined	0	3	1	0	5	1	3	3.50	1256/1459	4.04	4.05	4.16	4.25	3.50
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	951/1480	4.79	4.44	4.68	4.74	4.67
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teacl	ning effectiveness	1	0	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	792/1450	4.48	4.15	4.09	4.28	4.08
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	actor's lecture		prepared	2	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	826/1409	4.64	4.29	4.42	4.51	4.45
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	450/1407		4.68	4.69	4.79	4.92
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	567/1399		4.28	4.26	4.36	4.50
		es contribute to			1	0	0	1	1	1		4.50			4.23	4.27	4.38	4.50
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				2	2	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	464/1179	4.03	3.87	3.96	4.07	4.22
		Discus																
				what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	134/1262			4.05	4.33	4.89
				d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1259		4.53	4.29	4.57	5.00
				d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1256		4.56	4.30	4.60	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	133/ 788	4.83	3.97	4.00	4.26	4.67
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 6														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	L3	Non-	-major	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 2				_	gh								
				P 0									respons	es to b	oe sigr	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot]	her					6						
				? 1														

Course-Section: ENGL 407 0201 University of Maryland Title LANGUAGE IN SOCIETY Baltimore County Instructor: MCCARTHY, LUCIL Spring 2006

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Page 730

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	15				
Questionnaires:	13	Student C	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Ι

0

1

							Fre	201121	ncies			Tnat	ructor	Course	) Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			
1 Did wo	ı gəin no	Genera w insights,ski	_	m thia gourgo	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	143/1481	4.80	4.16	4.29	4.45	4.92
_	_	tor make clear			1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	228/1481	4.41	4.23	4.23	4.32	4.75
		ations reflect			1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1424	4.77	4.33	4.21	4.35	5.00
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	73/1396	4.77	4.05	3.98	4.09	4.92
				o what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	77/1342	4.73	4.34	4.07	4.21	4.92
		system clearl		_	1	0	0	1	1	0	10	4.58	367/1459	4.04	4.05	4.16	4.25	4.58
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	631/1480	4.79	4.44	4.68	4.74	4.92
9. How wou	ıld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	111/1450	4.48	4.15	4.09	4.28	4.88
		Lecture	_															
		ctor's lecture			2	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	319/1409	4.64		4.42	4.51	4.82
		tor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1407	4.96	4.68	4.69	4.79	5.00
				xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	203/1399	4.66	4.28	4.26	4.36	4.82
		s contribute to		-	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	146/1400	4.70	4.23	4.27	4.38	4.91
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	nhance your understanding			5	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	739/1179	4.03	3.87	3.96	4.07	3.83
		Discus																
1 Did al-	aa diaa			what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1262	4.94	4.28	4.05	4.33	5.00
				d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1252	5.00	4.53	4.05	4.57	5.00
				d to participate d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.56	4.29	4.60	5.00
		chniques succe		a open arscussion	5 5	1	0	0	0	0	o 7	5.00	1/1256	4.83	3.97	4.00	4.26	5.00
T. WELE SE	peciai ce	ciniiques succe	SSIUI		J		U	U	U	U	,	3.00	1/ /00	1.03	3.91	1.00	1.20	3.00
				Frequ	ency	ncy Distribution												
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons			Тут	26			Majors					
										, -								
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	1	Majo	r	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General				1	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	major	2			
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - Means there				_	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	

Other

Course-Section: ENGL 447 0101 University of Maryland Title ADV TOP IN LIT & CULTU Instructor: CARPENTER, KARE

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 731

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 6 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

I

?

0

0

							Fr	eque	ncies	\$		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	}	I	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did vo	ou gain ne		.ls from this course		0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.16	4.29	4.45	5.00
			the expected goals		0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	162/1481	4.83	4.23	4.23	4.32	4.83
			the expected goals		0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.31	4.27	4.44	5.00
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the expected goals		0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	165/1424	4.83	4.33	4.21	4.35	4.83
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to what you leari	ned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.05	3.98	4.09	5.00
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contri	bute to what you lea	arned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.34	4.07	4.21	5.00
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly	explained		0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.05	4.16	4.25	4.50
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	797/1480	4.83	4.44	4.68	4.74	4.83
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overal	l teaching effective	eness	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.15	4.09	4.28	4.00
		Lecture																
		actor's lectures			0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	290/1409	4.83	4.29	4.42	4.51	4.83
			ested in the subject		0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.79	5.00
			l and explained clear	rly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	187/1399	4.83	4.28	4.26	4.36	4.83
			what you learned		0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	591/1400	4.50	4.23	4.27	4.38	4.50
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques enh	ance your understand	ding	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	208/1179	4.60	3.87	3.96	4.07	4.60
		Discuss																
	class discussions contribute to what you learned				1	0	0	0	0	1	4		167/1262	4.80	4.28	4.05	4.33	4.80
			ouraged to participa		1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.53	4.29	4.57	5.00
			air and open discus	sion	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1256		4.56	4.30	4.60	5.00
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	ssful		1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	3.97	4.00	4.26	5.00
		Semina																
	_	-	to the announced the		2	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/ 68	5.00	4.72	4.49	4.68	5.00
			for individual attent		2	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/ 69	5.00	4.75	4.53	4.64	5.00
			ite to what you leari	ned	2	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/ 63		4.33	4.44	4.49	5.00
_			o what you learned		2	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/ 69	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.53	5.00
5. Were c	riteria 1	for grading made	e clear		2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	23/ 68	4.75	4.03	3.92	4.10	4.75
				Freque	ncy	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected G	rades				Rea	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0 A 3						or Ma	ior		0	 Graduat		0	Majo		3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 A 3			ved	1UII	cu I	OT MG	י זטר ג	٠	J	Graduat	_	J	ria JC	<i>-</i>	3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0 B 2 C 1				6	Non-	-major	3								
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3 D 0			GCI	ıcıa	_				J	onaci -g	Laa	•	14011		5
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1 F 0			Ele	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
	-		P 0									-	respons					,
			T 0			0+1						-	T CDPOILD	-2 CO 1	5191	LLLCai		

Other

Course-Section: ENGL 448 0101 University of Maryland Title SEMINAR IN LIT & CULTU

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor: Fernandez, Jean Enrollment: 9

Questionnaires: 7

Page 732 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Fireliation	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnarie

			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	0	7	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.16	4.29	4.45	5.00			
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	632/1481	4.43	4.23	4.23	4.32	4.43			
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.31	4.27	4.44	5.00			
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	248/1424	4.71	4.33	4.21	4.35	4.71			
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.05	3.98	4.09	5.00			
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	153/1342	4.71	4.34	4.07	4.21	4.71			
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	872/1459	4.14	4.05	4.16	4.25	4.14			
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1193/1480	4.29	4.44	4.68	4.74	4.29			
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	473/1450	4.40	4.15	4.09	4.28	4.40			
Lecture																	
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	290/1409	4.83	4.29	4.42	4.51	4.83			
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.79	5.00			
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	567/1399	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.36	4.50			
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	218/1400	4.83	4.23	4.27	4.38	4.83			
Discussion																	
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.28	4.05	4.33	5.00			
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.53	4.29	4.57	5.00			
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	658/1256	4.43	4.56	4.30	4.60	4.43			
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	713/ 788	3.00	3.97	4.00	4.26	3.00			
Seminar																	
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	1	0	Λ	0	Λ	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.72	4.49	4.68	****			
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	4.75	4.53	4.64	5.00			
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	59/ 63	3.50	4.33	4.44	4.49	3.50			
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.53	5.00			
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.03	3.92	4.10	****			
1 the terminal tot grading made order	-	-	•	Ü	Ü	_	Ŭ	1.00	, 00		1.05	2.22	1.10				
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n		Frequency Distribution										

#### Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	6	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	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	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 471 0101 University of Maryland Title ADV CREATIVE WRTNG:FIC Baltimore County

Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 733 JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: BAUSCH, ROBERT

Enrollment: 12 Ouestionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 1 0 7 4.75 217/1424 4.75 4.33 4.21 4.35 4.75 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 4 0 5 4.11 633/1396 4.11 4.05 3.98 4.09 4.11 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 3 6 4.67 190/1342 4.67 4.34 4.07 4.21 4.67 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 4.75 196/1459 4.75 4.05 4.16 4.25 4.75 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 7 1 4.13 1309/1480 4.13 4.44 4.68 4.74 4.13

9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 119/1450 4.86 4.15 4.09 4.28 4.86

Lecture

1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared

1. 0 0 0 3 2 3 4.00 1152/1409 4.00 4.29 4.42 4.51 4.00

2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject

1. 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1407 5.00 4.68 4.69 4.79 5.00

3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly

1. 0 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 431/1399 4.63 4.28 4.26 4.36 4.63

3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 431/1399 4.63 4.28 4.26 4.36 4.63 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 3 4 4.38 741/1400 4.38 4.23 4.27 4.38 4.38

Discussion

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1262 5.00 4.28 4.05 4.33 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1259 5.00 4.53 4.29 4.57 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1256 5.00 4.56 4.30 4.60 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 1 1 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 159/788 4.57 3.97 4.00 4.26 4.57

Frequency Distribution

Cum. GPA Expected Grades Credits Earned Reasons Type Majors 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 00 - 27B 1 C 0 D 0 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 84-150 4 3.00-3.49 3 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 General 6 Under-grad 9 Non-major 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other

Course-Section: ENGL 493 0101 University of Maryland Title SEMINAR IN CT Baltimore County Instructor: SHIPKA, JODY Spring 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 11

14

University of Maryland Page 734
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	Δ	5	4.27	818/1481	4.27	4.16	4.29	4.45	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	4		1000/1481	4.00	4.23	4.23	4.32	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	2		****/1249	****	4.31	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	959/1424		4.33	4.21	4.35	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	7		411/1396		4.05	3.98	4.09	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	8		354/1342		4.34	4.07	4.21	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	3	4		, -	4.00	4.05	4.16	4.25	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	904/1480	4.73	4.44	4.68	4.74	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	0	0	2	5	3.89	989/1450	3.89	4.15	4.09	4.28	3.89
Lecture	_	0	-	_	2		_	2 52	1050/1400	2 52	4 00	4 40	4 51	2 52
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	3	4	3		1258/1409	3.73	4.29	4.42	4.51	3.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	T	10	4.91		4.91	4.68	4.69	4.79	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1 1	0	0	5	5	4.18	892/1399 852/1400	4.18 4.27	4.28	4.26 4.27	4.36 4.38	4.18 4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	590/1179		3.87		4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	/	Τ	U	U	0	3	4.00	590/11/9	4.00	3.87	3.96	4.07	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	134/1262	4.89	4.28	4.05	4.33	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	229/1259	4.89	4.53	4.29	4.57	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	232/1256	4.89	4.56	4.30	4.60	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	304/ 788	4.22	3.97	4.00	4.26	4.22
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	51/ 68	4.17	4.72	4.49	4.68	4.17
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	52/ 69	4.33	4.75	4.53	4.64	4.33
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	42/ 63	4.17	4.33	4.44	4.49	4.17
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	53/ 69	3.83	4.71	4.35	4.53	3.83
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	52/ 68	3.33	4.03	3.92	4.10	3.33
Frequ	enci	. Dict	-rih	utio	n									
rtequ	епсу	ומדמ	-1 ID	ullo.	11									

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	11	Non-major	2	
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1	
				P	0				responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	6	-				
				2	0							